

34TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

June 19, 1985

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The hour of ten o'clock having arrived, the Senate will come to order. The members will be in their seats. Our guests in the gallery will please rise. Our prayer this morning will be by Rabbi Israil Zoberman of the Temple B'rith Sholom here in Springfield.

RABBI ZOBERMAN:

(Prayer given by Rabbi Zoberman)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, June 12th; Thursday, June 13th; Friday, June 14th and Tuesday, June 18th, in the year 1985, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Good morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

(Machine cutoff)...from the House.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I'm directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill with the following title, to-wit:

Senate Bill 321 together with House Amendment No. 1.

And a like Message on 328 with House Amendment No. 1.

A like Message on 828 with House Amendment No. 1.

A like Message on 1014 with House Amendment No.

1.

A like Message on 1084 with House Amendment No.

1.

A like Message on Senate Bill 1200 with House Amendment No. 2.

A like Message on Senate Bill 1132 with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 372...Senate Resolution 372, Senator Darrow, it's congratulatory.

Senate...Senate Resolution 373, Senator Rock and all Senators, congratulatory.

374, Senator Demuzio and all Senators, congratulatory.

375, Senator Dudycz, it's congratulatory.

376, Senator Davidson and all Senators, it's commendatory.

377, Senator Philip, Rock and all members, and it's commendatory.

(Machine cutoff)...378, Senator Watson, it's commendatory.

And 379, Senator Savickas, and it's a death resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. There has been a recall list that has been passed out to the members, it should be on your desk. The first order of business will go...will be to go to the Order of...of that Recall List. (Machine cutoff)...bill is Senate Bill 182, Senator Nedza. Senator Nedza seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 182 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is...is House Bill 182. Mr. Secretary. (Machine cut-

off)...192, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body...is there leave to have Senator Nedza handle this amendment? Leave is granted.

SECRETARY:

Senator Demuzio and Nedza.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment just increases the compensation for water commissioners up to a thousand dollars, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Nedza moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 192. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 257, Senator Luft. 312, Senator D'Arco. Senator D'Arco seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 312 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 312, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator D'Arco.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment was formerly a

Senate bill that passed this Chamber and somehow got waylaid in the House. What it says is that court reporters shall be paid a annually salary beginning July 1, 1986, of not less than six and no more than thirty...thirty-five thousand two hundred and fifty dollars, which would be an increase of two thousand dollars, and then on...beginning July 1, 1987, not less than thirty-seven two five zero which would be a...another increase of two thousand dollars. This bill did pass the Senate and I don't know of any objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator D'Arco moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 312. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No,...I'm sorry, Mr. President, that was Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right...Senator D'Arco moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 312. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Senator Savickas seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 320 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 320, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, yesterday we adopted Amendment No. 1, and what should have happened is to Table Amendment No. 1 and offer Amendment No. 2 which does the same thing as Amendment No. 1 except it deletes the repetitive language regarding...regarding the extra curricular activities that were in the Student Dropout Task Force language in Senate Bill 1213, and just to put the amendment on...on the bidding...competitive bidding. So, by Tabling Amendment No. 1, we would then adopt Amendment No. 2 and it would just do what Amendment No. 1 does without the repetitive...action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Savickas, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to Table...moves to...moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is reconsidered. Senator Savickas now moves to Table Amendment No. 1. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Savickas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 2 now and hope that this is the last one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Savickas moves the adoption of...Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 320. Any discussion?

HB 257
Recalled

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. What does Amendment No. 2 do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Amendment No. 2 does the same thing as Amendment No. 1 only it deletes all the language that refers to the...that refers to the extra curricular activity and the grants for the Dropout Task Force that is in Senate Bill 1213 and passed this House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Savickas moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 320. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Before we get too far away from it, I am told that the amendment is now ready on House Bill 257. With leave of the Body, we'll return and pick it up. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 257. Senator Luft seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 257 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 257, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. As a point of clarification, I

think yesterday we adopted a Floor Amendment No. 1. Am I correct, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Yes.

SENATOR LUFT:

At this time then having...voted on the prevailing side, I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted to House Bill 257.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

All right. Senator Luft moves to reconsider...having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The vote is reconsidered. Senator Luft now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 257. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 is virtually identical to Amendment No. 1, we just incorporated language that the Department of Revenue...asked or required; and at this point I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 257.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

All right. Senator Luft moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 257. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 334, Senator Mahar. Senator Mahar, are you...are you ready to proceed on 334? Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

...Senator Poshard is going to handle the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With...with...Senator Mahar seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 334 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 324, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard:

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This would amend the House Bill 334 to allow DCCA to designate up to two additional enterprise zones. Move for the passage of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Poshard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 334. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 335. Senator Maitland on the Floor? Senator Maitland on the Floor? Senate Bill 340, Senator Nedza. Senator...Nedza seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 340 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 340, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Nedza.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President. What the amendment does is closes in the definition of the motor home, minihome, van campers, recreational trailers, trailers, et cetera, and it just makes a more thorough explanation and it only allows those vehicles to be displayed and offered for sale on the Sundays, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Nedza moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 340. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 430, Senator Darrow. Senator Darrow on the Floor? 578, Senator Poshard. Senator Poshard seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 578 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an...Tabling an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 578, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 which was adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Like to Table Amendment...No. 1 which is technically incorrect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

MS 430
Received

All right. Senator Poshard, having moved...having voted on the prevailing side, moves to Table Amendment No. 1...moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion is reconsidered. Senator Poshard now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 578. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 simply adds the technical language that is necessary to clarify the amendment we just Tabled. Move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 578. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Senator Darrow has now returned to the Floor. So with leave of the Body, let's go back up and pick up House Bill 430. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading,...Senator Darrow seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 430 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, 430, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

This is Clarence's bill? The...the amendment simply says that we're going to allow for civilians who are prisoners of war to...to come under the same umbrella as the current prisoners of war as far as license plates are concerned. There are some three civilians is what...all we're able to find in Illinois that were actually...and in Vietnam and were...considered prisoners of war, but they were...they were civilians, they weren't actually veterans and this just puts them in that umbrella.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 430. Any discussion? Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this amendment because in effect what it does is when you're bringing in the civilian population, maybe justifiably or not, is what you're doing is opening up Pandora's box in the effect that who is to say that the...the nation of the Philippine Islands at the time of their occupation, Vietnam, Korea and what other country that...unfortunately had to befallen unto the...the domination of the...the posing power during the World War II is that they also could not be construed as prisoners of war.

Therefore, you would be taking what has been a special privilege for those who served in the armed services and gave of their lives and their bodies and what have you...to take this and say, all right, fine, because you happen to be in a particular area and you are a civilian that we are going to include you in the same thing. I think it's unjustified and

it's a...a slap in the face to those who served in our armed services and were prisoners of war as we...in the connotation that we understand prisoners of war to be. So, I, therefore, rise in opposition to the amendment and ask everyone else to join me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Watson may close.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. It certainly isn't our intent to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator Watson. Can we have some order and break up the caucuses?...

SENATOR WATSON:

...it certainly isn't our intent to...to bring into the...the benefits of a prisoner of war the individuals that Senator Nedza mentioned. The...the amendment is really directed towards three people from Illinois who would come under the category of a prisoner of war, who were actually civilians who were working in Vietnam but were considered prisoners of war at that particular time. They suffered as long as...was well as a veteran and I...I do feel that this is a justified amendment and I'd appreciate support. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Watson moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 430. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion is...motion fails. Senator Watson, you wish to have a roll call? All right. Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 430. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 24, the Nays are 26. Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 605, Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 605 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 605, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell, your mike is dead. Why don't you move over to Senator Dunn's desk. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Yeah, could you refresh my memory. I know it's a sort of a nothing amendment, but...

SECRETARY:

The word "the" following "procedures governing the." Does that do it?

SENATOR FAWELL:

That's what the amendment is.

SECRETARY:

That's the amendment. By...on line 11, by inserting immediately after the word "the" the following, "procedures governing the."

SENATOR FAWELL:

It's...it's a technical amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Fawell moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 605. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have

it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. All right. Is there leave to come back to 720? Leave is granted. 743, Senator Zito. 743, on the recall list. Senator Zito seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 743 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 743, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Mr. President, can we have leave to come back to this for a...I have a problem with this one and I'd like to get back to it at the end of the recall list, if that's okay?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there...is there leave to get back to it? Let's leave the bill on...on the Order of 2nd Reading, Mr. Secretary, and with leave of the Body, we'll...we'll return to it. Is leave granted? All right...all right. Senator Zito indicates that he is ready to proceed the...House Bill 743 is on the Order of 2nd Reading. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Yes, thank...thank you, Mr. President and members. This is a clarifying amendment that changes the present language to include the director and changes that to the Illinois

Criminal Justice Information Authority. It's a clarifying amendment, I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Zito has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 743...is there any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 807. Senator Topinka seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 807 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 807, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Topinka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this amendment to the Missing Child Recovery Act comes to us from the Department of Law Enforcement. It basically clarifies custody, defines that better, also defines specific situations in abduction and I know of no opposition to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 807. Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. (Machine cutoff)...Maitland, are you ready on 335? 809, Senator Poshard. Senator Poshard seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 809 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 809, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an amendment that we agreed to in committee to draft to bring more specificity to the...bill in dealing with the particular river conservancy district that the bill addresses. Ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 809. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 852, Senator Marovitz. Senator Marovitz seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 852 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 852, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and members of the

HB 883
Recalled

Senate. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 852 clarifies that the foster parent of a child may apply to the guardian of a child in the case where the foster parent would like to adopt that child, and it...it specifies how that application would occur and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 852.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 852. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 880, Senator Degnan. 883, Senator Friedland. Are you ready? House bills...Senator Friedland seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 883 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, 883, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Geo-Karis and Friedland.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I cleared this amendment with Senator Tim...Degnan, the...the chairman of the Local Government Committee, and the...and the minority spokesman, Senator Watson, and I move the passage of this amendment. What this amendment does is incorporate the bill that was passed here 59 to zero in which the House committee summarily had a tie vote, and I move the passage of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 883. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 950, Senator Rigney. Senator Rigney seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 950 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, 950, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Rigney.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Mr. President, House Bill 950 is the one that creates the Illinois Milk Products Promotion Fund, and the amendment while it's about three pages in length is really technical amendment that does not make any substantive changes in the general bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rigney has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 950. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 975, Senator Lemke. All right. Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 975 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is

leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, 975, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Philip and Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this amendment does is...is allows McDonnell Douglas to do their experimental with short-barrel rifles in the State of Illinois. The way the bill is now, McDonnell Douglas who does this money for the...this work for the government can't shoot or possess short-barrel guns. I think it's a good amendment, I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 975. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. All right. Is there any discussion? Senator Marovitz. Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I...I'd like to hear a little more explanation to this amendment. I mean,...first explanation sounds like we're giving McDonnell Douglas the right to...what is this about short-barrel rifles or something? I know...I know it's early and we don't want to get into any big discussions but I think you ought to explain it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What we're doing here is, the amendment merely permits...what...we have passed the bill that says you can't have short-barrel rifles in the State. What this amendment does is just leaves...what's...presently we've done which says the merely..."permits a person who has a contract with the U.S. Government to develop and supply short-barrel

weapons or ammunition to such weapons to possess or otherwise engage in commercial or experimental activities involving the weapons which are necessary to fulfill the contractual terms." The exemption also extends to Federal subcontractors and to authorized agents acting within the scope of their employment. It strictly...the amendment is strictly limited to those activities which are necessary and incidental to the contractual terms.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lenke has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 975. Those in...Senator...Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yeah, I...see some staff over here that I could probably talk to to get the answer on this, but we're not tying this amendment into any kind of Federal regulations of any kind, are we? So we got another...you know, the old machine gun thing, we're not falling for that again. We're all for helping arms manufacturers but we're not going to open that Pandora's box again I hope.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

That...that...this is what that amendment does, see, it just says that the arms manufacturer has to have a contract with the U.S. Government to develop and...and supply...just applies to the manufacturer and not to the...not to anybody else owning machine guns. It's...what we have now is the fact that if we pass the bill, McDonnell Douglas who's a...in this State would lose a contract of about eight million dollars a year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you. I believe the last question...dealt with some of my concerns. I believe this amendment takes care of Olin Matheson and the gun manufacturers here in this State who have...who may have a Federal contract and have to test the weapons and the manufacturing within...within the State of Illinois, and I really don't see anything wrong with this amendment. I would encourage its support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Etheredge. Senator Etheredge. Can we break up the caucus? Senator Etheredge, your light is on. Do you wish to speak on this? All right. Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Olin is in my district and...and if I understand Senator Lechowicz, he said if they have a contract it would...this amendment would not affect them but say, for instance, their contract has expired and now they negotiate for a new contract, this would affect them and they would be preempted from then on. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

This doesn't preempt them. If they get a new contract to make more guns, then they can do it. As long as they can show proof that they have a contract with the U.S. Government to develop or supply short-barrel weapons or ammunition, they're exempt...yes, if they have a contract now or they get a contract in the future. That's what this is to allow these manufacturers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Marovitz has requested a roll...Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

HB 1265
Recall

Senate. I...I just might try to clear the air a little bit, it happens to be...my suggestion to Senator Lemke in regards to the amendment, and, very honestly, I have a manufacturer in my district that I didn't know about, he has a Federal contract. What this says it...doesn't apply to anybody that has a Federal contract. If it does apply to him, he's out of business, he can fold up his little business in Bensenville, Illinois and go home...he depends on that Federal contract and that's all it says, it excludes Federal contracts. We ought to support this amendment, it's a good amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Marovitz requests a roll call. Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 975. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 43, the Nays are 2, 2 voting Present. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1265, Senator Berman. Senator Berman seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1265 to the Order of...of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1265, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. This...bill deals with the mandatory arbitration system authorization to the Illinois Supreme Court. The

amendment merely specifies that the procedures that are going to be adopted by rule by the Supreme Court would be adapted to each judicial circuit. The purpose of the amendment is to allow input by local bar associations and attorneys in the formation of this procedure. It was agreed upon between bar associations and the administrative office of the Supreme Court. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Berman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1265. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1267, Senator Lemke. On the Order of House...Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1267 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 1267, Mr. Secretary, read...

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Darrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Darrow. Senator Darrow on the Floor? Is there leave to have Senator Lemke handle the amendment? Leave is granted. Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

This is an amendment requested by the Supreme Court. What this does is amends House Bill 171 into this bill. I think it's a good amendment. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator...Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's my understanding this

amendment pertains to the administrative assistant to the chief judge. The bill was on postponed consideration. This is an amendment to...Senator Lemke's bill pertaining to the same subject matter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Darrow has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1267. Any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, I...I don't understand still the amendment. What...what does it do? I didn't...I don't remember House Bill 171. Does this amendment...provide for appointing an...an assistant to the circuit judge...chief circuit judge or what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

At the present time, there are twenty individuals around the State who are secretaries to the chief judge. They're called secretaries, this changes their title to administrative assistants to the chief judge. It allows the Supreme Court to determine their salary. Through the appropriation process, we'll have some control over it and that's basically what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO) .

Indicates he will yield. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

...does this...Senator Darrow, does this allow the court to set the salaries? There's no caps involved?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Unfortunately, I left my amendment downstairs. It's...it's my understanding that what the cap is, is it...it ties in with the salary paid court reporters which is the cap that we now use. The...there was some concern that there would be no cap on this...yes,...what it does, "A maximum salary for administrative assistants shall be the same as the maximum salaries presently established and hereafter established from time to time for full-time official court reporters in Section 8 of the Court Reporters Act." So it sets a cap as was requested by a number of members.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Senator Darrow, how is this different from the previous House bill? Is it...are there any changes at all from 171?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Absolutely. There was concern that there would be no cap on the amount that these people could be paid. In this amendment we are placing a cap on this so we have two safeguards; one, we have the cap of the salary as the same salary as court reporters receive; and secondly, we have the appropriation process to guard against this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

I appreciate you answering that question because it's my understanding that 171 is still on postponed consideration and there was a number of problems with that legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, there is a cap. If you'll look at the court reporter's Statute, it says up to twenty-nine thousand five hundred, if I recall correctly. So there is a cap on it and it differs from 171 because House Bill 171, if I can refer to Senator Zito, had no cap on it but this one does. This does have a cap.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Weaver. Could we have some order, please?

SENATOR WEAVER:

It appears to me that we're really raising the cap from up to thirty-seven thousand two hundred and fifty dollars. Is that true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

What we are doing, at the present time, these twenty individuals cannot get a pay increase without coming to the General Assembly. What this legislation does is allow the Supreme Court to determine their salary with a cap, the same as the cap we have given court reporters. It does not necessarily mean that the Supreme Court will pay them that amount of money but that is the cap. There was concern that we had no cap and that the only safeguard would be the appropriation process. It was felt that if we went back and put a cap on, probably the best cap we could put would be the same as the court reporters because these people do equivalent

type of work or amount of work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Two quick questions. I had someone explain to me that these are basically sophisticated secretaries. Now, I can guarantee you that my secretary does a great job but I've never been able to convince Pate to pay her thirty-seven thousand five hundred dollars, although I'm working on Pate. Are we letting perhaps one little branch get a little out of line with people who are of certainly comparable skills and probably doing harder work? I mean, how would you like to work with some pigheaded guys like us? I mean, could you give us a more accurate description of who these individuals are?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Well, I can't speak for all twenty of them but the one in our circuit does a number of tasks other than just secretary; for example, she schedules the judges for the various courts, she appears before the county board on behalf of the judiciary, she handles a number of...of public relations...situations with the newspapers, things like that. It's not just a secretary, that's why we're changing it to more of an administrative assistant. There's also a possibility by the way of other legislation that's currently before this Body to have this applied to DuPage and Cook County, and it's my understanding in those counties, especially in DuPage County, that the administrative assistant has two assistants under her and it's very comprehensive job in DuPage County and takes a very skilled person, and, hopefully, we will be able to assist DuPage County and some of the...the entire State at times.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I appreciate the explanation and when we can convince the cheapskates like Pate and Phil that our secretaries who do the exact same job, and in some cases do better, that we ought to be paying them that level which...you could convince me of without a second thought. But the point is, I think we're letting a small group get a little out of line because it's a small group. I would recommend that this is the same court that doesn't allow us to audit funds that they collect involuntarily from attorneys who practice in front of them, offering money to a group who perhaps are getting out of line with people who do similar or substantially tougher jobs. Let me assure you, my secretary does a great deal of what you just said and does just as good a job and she puts up with me. She is a saint and until we can convince Pate and Phil to raise salaries to that level, I think we really should reexamine this number.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Well, I would...I would acknowledge that Senator Keats' secretary is a saint, she'd have to be to work with him. Other than that, these are not actually just secretaries, these...these court personnel do quite a bit of other things other than just secretarial work. They're vital to the...judicial circuits at the present time. In this legislation what we are doing is we're just putting them on a par with the court reporters and not necessarily paying them the same as a court reporter, that's going to be up to the Judicial Branch of government in their appropriation bill. I'd ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Darrow has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1267. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. There's been a roll call requested. Senator Darrow moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1267. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? (Machine cutoff)...all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 24, the Nays are 28, 1 voting Present. Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1479, Senator Welch. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1479 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 1479, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Welch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. The purpose of this amendment is to strip everything from the bill with the exception of the amendment that I put on yesterday. This was the agreement that was made in the Public Health Committee; unfortunately, I didn't have the amendment...in hand yesterday when the bill was on 2nd reading. So I would move the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1479. Any discussion? If not, those in favor

signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it.
Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1677. Senator Barkhausen seeks leave of
the Body to return House Bill 1677 to the Order of 2nd
Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted?
Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 1677, Mr. Secre-
tary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Barkhausen, is it your intent to Table Amendment
No. 1?

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Yes, it is, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and members, I am asking the Body to Table
Amendment No. 1 that was placed on this bill in committee
due to the opposition that was expressed to it yesterday.
This was the bill that makes it unlawful for nonlawyers to
receive a fee for...for referring cases to lawyers, and we
had gone beyond the fee concept to include noncash benefits
in the amendment in committee and that proved to be objec-
tionable yesterday on the Floor. So, I'm moving here to...to
Table Amendment No. 1 so that it will merely be unlawful
simply to accept a fee and there will be no reference to non-
cash...receipt of noncash benefits...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator...

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

...I would urge the...my...passage of my motion to Table.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Barkhausen, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted. Any discussion? Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is reconsidered. Now, Senator Barkhausen moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1677. Any discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I thought there was an awful lot of discussion on this amendment yesterday when it was adopted, and basically what it says that whether it's cash or noncash you should not accept any type of a monetary or unmonetary means in reference to referring a case to an attorney, and I...in fact, I think the bill...really is lacking in many ways, but in reality with Amendment No. 1, if you really want a clean...to clean up any reference of...asking a person to represent somebody and in turn you may take a...a trip somewhere, I don't think that's...should...should be allowed to begin with; and that was the purpose of Amendment No. 1, and if you really want to make something very stringent, this amendment should stay on the bill. If you're really concerned in this area,...Amendment No...No. 1 does clarify House Bill 1677 and it makes it...the...very clear that you accept neither money nor any type of gratuity in any fashion on the reference of a case to an attorney. I think it was a good amendment then, it's a good amendment now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke, there is frankly no discussion on the Tabling motion, but...Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

No, I think the...we're...I think the amendment is a good

amendment because...very simple. It just says you can't...kept...accept a fee in the way of cash or noncash for referring a case. That's all it says and if you refer a case, I mean...a guy can give you a gold watch and that's okay, but he can't give you ten dollars and...this...so I mean, I think this is a good amendment, it should stay on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, the...the motion is to reconsider...no, I'm...the motion is to Table. Senator Barkhausen, you wish to close? I don't know how we got into this discussion.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

I...I have a little bit of...trouble arguing with Senator Lechowicz or Senator Lenke because even though it was Senator Lenke's amendment in committee, I happen to agree that it probably was a good idea. I'm simply moving to Table at this point because I got a pretty clear reading yesterday that there was strong objection to an attempt to expand the coverage of this bill beyond the straight fee situation to also include noncash benefits, and it's one of those situations where a half of loaf is better than no loaf at all. I don't care that much one way or the other. I was trying to go with the will of the Body here in moving to Table Amendment No. 1 and so that is my motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Barkhausen has moved to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1677. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. Well, in the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it. Is there a request? Motion fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 1948, Senator Etheredge. Senator Etheredge seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill

1948 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House Bill 1948, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Etheredge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you, Mr. President. The...Amendment No. 1 which was adopted yesterday is technically incorrect. I have filed a second amendment to replace No. 1. So, therefore, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Etheredge, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1948 was adopted. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The vote is reconsidered. Senator Etheredge now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1948. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2, by Senator Etheredge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

This is a amendment which is now technically correct and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Etheredge has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1948. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1953. Senator Geo-Karis seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1953 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House Bill 1953, Mr. Secretary, House bills 2nd reading.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I believe that is LRB ending in LKSAM? Is that LRB ending in L...LB...LKSAM? Amendment No. 1 deletes the word "displaying" and inserts thereof the words "which is parked at a self-service island and displays." I have cleared this amendment with both Senator Nedza, the chairman of the Transportation Committee, and also with Senator Coffey, the minority spokesman of...Transportation Committee, and I move the passage of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Geo-Karis moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1953. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2, by Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Amendment No. 2 simply provides that this...it says, Section 3. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1986, and I move the passage of this amendment, and I cleared that with

HB 1955
Revised

both sponsors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Geo-Karis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1953. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1955, Senator Philip. Senator Philip seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1955 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 1955, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's merely a technical amendment. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1955. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is...wait a minute...Amendment No. 2 is adopted...wait a minute...all right. Senator Philip, the chair is in error. It's...you moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1955. Is there any discussion on that? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is...is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. All right. Senator...1962. Senator Dunn seeks leave of the Body to return 1962 to the Order of...of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, 1962, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Dunn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 changes "shall" to "shall within...shall immediately...to shall within two hours as requested by any peace officers." This has to do with timber haulers showing proof of ownership and I'd move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Dunn has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1962. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. If you'll turn to page...2232. Senator Karpel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2232 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 2232, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What this does, unbeknownst to me, the regional superintendent of schools is the only county office that if a superintendent is indicted or dies or resigns that automatically his deputy becomes the superintendent. What this amendment provides is that he does not or she does not automatically become the...the superintendent, and that we would choose that superintendent the same way we do any other county office. As you know, we've had a problem in our own county with our regional...two regional superintendents; hopefully, this may solve some of the problems. Be happy to...answer any questions, I move the adoption of Amendment No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Amendment No. 2? All right. Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2232. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 2275. Senator Karpziel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2275 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2275, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Karpziel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpziel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 simply adds one more lay person or citizen to the...the Advisory Library Committee making it a committee now of twenty instead of nineteen. I understand that was suggested by the Auditor General.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpziel has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2275. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 2437, Senator Keats. 2440, Senator Rigney. On the Order of House...Senator Rigney seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2440 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2440, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Rigney.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen, I think probably most of you will remember that earlier in the...in the Session, I had a bill that would have allowed for unattended service stations in the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, I called that bill on a Tuesday when attendance was not what it should have been. There were eight people missing on that particular occasion, and, yet, I received twenty-nine votes for its passage. As a result of this, it became the first bill that went on postponed consideration; unfortunately, we never got back to that item of business. I reviewed that

roll call and reconsidered the objections to the bill and then addressed the amendment by making two very significant changes in the bill. First of all, it was obvious to me that based upon the roll call that Cook County didn't want any part of the bill. So the amendment took Cook...is now taking Cook County out of the bill. The second part of it is that the original bill would have allowed for either coin-operated, card-operated or key-operated...pumps. The amended form of this bill now will take the coin-operated machines out of the bill, which means that the only thing is left are the card machines and the key machines which gives complete control of those devices to the owner...to the service station owner. He simply is not going to give either a card or a key to someone that he does not trust. I think these are probably two very helpful amendments and I seek your support on Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This also is a bill that wound up on consideration postponed and it wound up that way for a very good reason. It's a bad idea and...and I don't think you're solving the problem by just saying it doesn't apply to Cook County. It is still a bad idea, the county notwithstanding. It's just bad public policy and I think this amendment ought to be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you...Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of...of the Senate. In...the first time this bill was...was heard in the...in the Chamber, there was some concern over on our side of the aisle, particularly with myself, and it seems

to me that I have received a great number of letters from people involved in agriculture that suggest that this is in fact a...a good amendment; and contrary to my...to my friend on my left, I intend to support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Rigney moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2440. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those...a roll call has been requested. A roll call has been requested. All those in favor of adopting Amendment No. 1 will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. (Machine cutoff)...all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Yeas are 34, the Nays are 8, 1 voting Present. Amendment No. 1 having received the majority vote is declared adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. On the Order of Recalls on the Secretary's Desk Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 69, Senator Lemke. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senator Lemke has Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 69.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does is correct a technical grammatic error that the staff found. It adds the word "is" after "she," they...when they drafted, they left out the word "is." I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No, not on this one, next one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 69. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

We will return Senate Joint Resolution 69 back to the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions. We will return now to the front of the recall sheet. We have three...three bills that...four bills that should be picked up. Senate...or House Bill 335, Senator Maitland. Senator Maitland seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 335 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 335. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Rigney.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, Mr. President, I have a great temptation here to say that this is just a merely amendment, but in all candor, it's lot more than that. Actually what it is, it's the pothole amendment of 1985 and we might just as well lable it for what it is. You will recall that last year we voted through an increase in the motor fuel tax and we voted through an increase in license plate fees. We told the motorists of Illinois that we were going to be needing that kind of money to adequately take care of Illinois roads, and, yet, before the ink was hardly dry on all of that, we went and turned around and gave thirty million out of that fund to

the...upcoming emission's program, forever committing ourselves to pay in for that program out of motor fuel monies. I think this is an outrage because not only is this money taken away from the State of Illinois, but it's money that's taken away from every city, every county, every township that receives money out of the Motor Fuel Fund. This is a very simple and easy to understand amendment. What it provides for is that the money for the emission's program instead of being taken out of the Motor Fuel Fund will be taken out of the General Revenue Fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? We have Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, very much. I, too, agree that an outrage has been caused and the...and the cause has been the Federal Government. We should have never passed the darn bill to begin with. DuPage County is being hooked in on this and we have had absolutely no readings of the pollutions they are talking about recorded in our county, and I...we have four stations in our county, in the entire year of 1984. As I told you last year, the readings...in Chicago were as small as two hours in Lincoln Park. I personally think we ought to...amend this bill all right, but we ought to amend it to knock the whole darn emission's bill out and send it back to Congress and tell them, we aren't in compliance and they ought to forget the whole darn program instead of trying to clip us for fifty million dollars to run the program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I sympathize totally with Senator Rigney's problem. I...I...I share that problem and I...I think that Senator Fawell makes a good point that we were...had some-

thing forced upon us that simply should not have happened. But the fact of the matter is, this is a thirty million dollar raid now on the General Revenue Fund, and I think that's just quite inappropriate and probably the amendment should be killed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Joyce. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Some of the items that Senator Rigney pointed out are probably concerns of not only people in his area but throughout the State. Also, what the...Senator Fawell mentioned in reference to the...probability of the animosity of the people that are going to have to go through the testing procedure, it's probably true; but unfortunately, when we discussed this matter last year...in fact, we had two or three different groups that sat down and finally ironed out the mandatory emission testing program, and the gentleman in...who is presently in the Chair had a role in that, a very important role, Senator Doc Davidson had an important role, Senator Nedza, Senator Rock and others, we finally came up with a legislative solution and let me point out to you if you forgot; unfortunately, the Federal Government had a hundred million dollar price tag whether the State would have a mandatory auto emission's testing program or not, and we were faced with the dilemma of the State of Illinois losing a hundred million dollars last year and a total of over a half a billion dollars during the course of the Federal Highway Entitlement Program that the State could possibly lose. The Governor and this Body and the House concurred that it was best to accept a legislative compromise instead of losing the Federal money and that's what's at issue, and what we worked out last year hasn't even come into being and this amendment...would withdraw the funding for the poor people who are

going to be tested in...for the environmental impact of the automobile. I think this is a bad amendment. I believe we came up with a legislative solution which would save the State of Illinois the Federal money, and, yes, the people in not only Chicago and Cook County but in other urban areas of the State as determined by the zip code will be mandated to take their vehicles through this testing procedure. They're going to lose that time from work and all we did was to provide them so they wouldn't have to necessitate in paying for that procedure from their own pockets, that it came from the general...came from the Road Fund of the State of Illinois based upon a legislative compromise. That's why I thought it was a good idea then, it's a good idea now; and for that reason, I strongly oppose Amendment No. 2. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Hall.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HALL:

Senator Rigney, I'm sorry that I was away. Now, just what does your amendment do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Evidently, Senator Lechowicz also missed the point of what my amendment does. It does not require the people living in those areas to pay for their own tests. The money to pay for the program will come from the General Revenue Fund instead of the...instead of the Motor Fuel Fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Well, I opposed that whole thing when it was up last time. You know, it's...we're talking about after the fact, but if there ever was a law that was discriminatory, this is one. Here the pollution is in Cook County and then it jumps three hundred miles down the State and then it comes into Senator Vadalabene's area and my area and Senator Watson's area. Now Senator Watson has something on that that puts it on to say it'll go by zip code. You know, it's just ridiculous that we got a bill where the pollution will just be over an area if...if the zip code differs. What I'm trying to do, I thought...my understanding is the whole doggone thing ought to be repealed. It's a bad bill from the word go. I am...certainly want to do anything to help kill the bill, so I haven't decided what I'm going to do right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Perhaps I can address one of the portions that Senator Rigney said in response to Senator Lechowicz that he's...misconstruing exactly what it is, is taking it out of the General Revenue Fund. Well, let me just remind this Body that the motor fuel tax funds are matching funds which are the Federal funds that we receive which was dangled over our head and panicked everybody into passing this legislation

into a compromise kind of a position. The greatest number of contributing funds into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund allegedly come from the areas which are now...mandated to have emission's testing. If we are the largest contributors, we are the largest polluters, then the money is a wash, so we should not be forced to pay not out of the General Revenue Fund because the General Revenue Fund is...is used for...and God knows what, but right now we're going to be facing a great dilemma of financing education and Build Illinois and what have you. The Motor Fuel Tax Fund is the proper fund in order to pay for this. Those are the people that are contributing it because they're using most of it, they're putting most of the money into it and I think that's where it should stay; and we all agree that it's a bad bill but it's a necessity that we have to live with, so let's leave it alone and defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise in opposition to Amendment No. 2 and the fact is is...as was pointed out, we had an agreement without which there would not have been an emission testing program, and the agreement was that the Federal money which we then received because we went to the program would in part be used to pay for it; and to change it now, it just seems to we...we ought not do it. The General Revenue Fund cannot stand this kind of an impact, and if you're going to take money from education to pay for emission testing, I think you're making a mistake. I urge opposition to Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rigney moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 335. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Roll call has been requested. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those

opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 8, the Nays are 29, none voting Present. Amendment No. 2 having failed to receive a majority vote is declared lost. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 450. Senator Vadalabene seeks leave of the Body...amendments aren't here. On the Order of Recalls...for what purpose Senator DeAngelis arise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

State your point.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

In the gallery right behind the Republican side we have Helen Barret, the Clerk of Onee Township and her husband, Mr. Helen, and their son, Lawrence. I would like for them to stand and be recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Please...please rise and be recognized. On the Order...on our recall sheet, we have House Bill 720. Senator Rock seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 720 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 720. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Rock and Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 is identical to a bill that passed out of this Chamber with an

overwhelming majority. It restructures the leadership for the Senate. The House did not see fit to let the bill out of committee. So, we are amending this bill and we'll send it back to them with the assurance that it will be acted upon. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Rock moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 720. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just for the benefit of the membership, if I can have the members' attention. We will, with leave of the Body, then return to page 52 on the Calendar and again proceed through House bills on 2nd reading. Senator Philip and I have agreed to handle the Build Illinois program tomorrow in terms of adoption or rejection of committee amendments, but the House bills on 2nd reading, I think we can adequately go through again today and we will again tomorrow. In the meantime, because of the action we took yesterday where we were able to successfully move three hundred and fifteen bills, we have determined it will not...it will not be necessary for us to be in Session over the weekend, so we will not have Session on Saturday or Sunday. We will work on Friday until roughly mid-afternoon and return to Springfield on Monday at noon. I have just had the opportunity along with Senator Philip to meet with the House leadership and the Governor. There are a number, obviously, of yet unresolved issues. We have agreed we will be here over the weekend to go from one summit meeting to

HB 18
2nd Reading

another...one subject matter to another with the hope that on Monday we can arrive at some agreement on some substantive issues, but in the meantime, I'm happy to report that we will not have to be here en masse over the weekend. Those of you who want to stay are certainly welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

On a lighter note, House bills 2nd reading. On page 52, middle of the page, we'll start with House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 17, Senator Lechowicz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. For what purpose Senator Geo-Karis arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I would like to remind all the Senators here that Sunday evening at 6:30 p.m. we are going to have Greek Night on the grounds of the Mansion, and if the weather is bad we will have it at the State Fairgrounds. So, I do hope you'll get back in time to enjoy the good food and the comradery.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Mr. Secretary, House Bill 17.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 17.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 18, Senator Welch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

*HB 100
2nd Reading*

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 18.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 23, Senator Welch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 23.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 27, Senator Welch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 27.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 49, Senator Luft. House Bill 52, Senator Marovitz. House Bill 53, Senator Marovitz. House Bill 100, Senator O'Daniel. Read the bill, Mr. Secre-

tary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 100.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elections offers Amendments Nod. 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Mr. President and members of the Senate,...I move to Table...I don't think it...it is numbered but...but it's the longer one of the amendments...to Table that amendment. We want...we want to Table the long one and...and adopt the short one. Table No. 1 and adopt No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator O'Daniel moves to Table Amendment...Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 100. Is there opposition? Hearing no objection, the motion carries. Are there further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment...Committee Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

...Amendment No. 2 requires a county clerk or municipal election board by sixty days before the election to give notice of the availability to the elderly and the handicapped of registration aides at permanent registration facilities of voting aides at polling places and a voter assistance in marking ballots and...and voting absentee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there a discussion? Senator Poshard. If not, Senator O'Daniel moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 100. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed.

The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator...Mahar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 incorporates the language of Amendment No. 1, plus adds a provision which defines the...the number of judges which may leave the polling place to assist a handicapped or disabled voter. I'd like to read...read this, it's very short, "and except that when a polling place is...inaccessible to disabled voter, one team of two judges of opposite party affiliation may leave the polling place to deliver a ballot to such voter as provided."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Mahar moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 100. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 123, Senator Dawson. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 123.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elementary and

Secondary...Education offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Dawson.

SENATOR DAWSON:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Amendment No. 1 makes technical changes in the bill. It changes the pilot project to a demonstration project, clarifies that the State Board of Education shall enter into contracts rather than direct the establishment of such projects, and rather than the State Board of Education so it designates the projects by 1-1-86, states that the State Board shall enter into contracts by that date, deletes redundant or informal language in describing the purposes of social work projects.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Dawson moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 123. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 142, Senator Bloom. Senator Karpel is handling it for Senator Bloom? Senator Bloom. House Bill 146, Senator Kustra. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 146.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Kustra.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment was requested by the committee in an attempt to clarify the language of the bill. I've discussed it with the chairman of the committee and there may be a problem with the language. I think what I'd like to do now is move it on to 3rd with the assurance that if there is a problem, I would call it back on a recall tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Are you withdrawing the amendment, Senator? Oh, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, may I...refer my comments to the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Well, sure.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Are you putting this amendment out...or on or are you taking it off?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

I want to put the amendment on, Senator. I think it's a good amendment. There's been some concern expressed on the other side of the aisle and I just want to wait to hear what they...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any further...Senator Geo-Karis.

HB 181
Recall

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

...this is not the amendment then that refers to cleaning up vote fraud? Oh, that's all I want to know. I have no objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Kustra moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 146. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 157, Senator Davidson. House Bill 181, Senator Netsch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. 181 is the Netsch-Kustra...hold...hold the bill, Mr. Secretary. House Bill 217, Senator...Senator Netsch, we are on page 53 of House bills 2nd reading. House Bill 181, Senator Netsch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 181.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Kelly and Lechowicz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This is a Floor Amendment No. 1...what it does is it changes the base for determining the number of required petition signatures from votes cast at the last election to number of registrants within the district or subdivision. I'd move for

the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Well, regretfully I have to stand in strong opposition to this...on the surface...simple amendment. The requirement in the law now is the percentage of those who are voting...highest vote getters...votes cast and this changes it to the registered voters in the district or political subdivision and I think that is just totally unacceptable. I think it's...it's...it makes it extremely hard for those candidates who are running for office and certainly I've...you know, I know that in...in our area, at least, I can't speak for those committeemen or those people in...in the wards in the cities, but I can tell you that this will certainly be met with strong opposition from my side of the aisle and...and from those seeking office that would have to go under this kind of petition gathering. So, I oppose this amendment strongly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. As the sponsor of the bill, I also would rise in opposition to the amendment. I don't have a copy of it but as I understand it, you're changing the base from...or from those who voted in the last election to those registered, and clearly what this is intended to do is a variation of what the committee rejected at the time the bill was heard in committee and that is to make it more difficult for people to file for the office of township or ward committeeman. I think the amendment was offered in committee to increase the number from five percent to ten percent and that was ultimately defeated and I think this has the effect of doing not just that but probably something even more onerous

in terms of getting on the ballot. I...my argument then and my argument now is that the reason for having petition requirements is to make it just difficult enough that there will not be a whole slew of frivolous candidates for whatever office it might be, a public office or a...a party office. It is not intended to become so heavy a burden that, in fact, people who are genuinely and seriously interested are deterred from running, particularly with all of the...the intricacies that are involved in getting petitions correctly signed and notarized and so forth and it seems to me that raising the base to registered voters is clearly just an...incredible burden...alas, as we know, huge number of people who are registered do not, in fact, vote. So, what you are doing is just creating an artificial base to begin with and it seems to me that it is totally inappropriate for this bill, and I would strongly urge a No vote on the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator...Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Basically, this amendment does not increase from five to ten percent as far as the number of people that are required to sign a petition. What we're doing is...the threshold is still five percent and we're trying to provide an equitable base that does fluctuate every six or seven months based upon the previous election. The number of registered people in an area is governed after the registration and what this bill requires is that the number of registrants...we all know as far as in our respective wards or townships the number of registered voters and you're requiring five percent of the registered voters to sign a petition for a candidate. I don't believe it's excessive nor do I think that it's...that it's...hurts a candidate in any

way till you know...definite number of signatures are required in order for you to run for public office. I think this is a good amendment and deserves your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise in support of the amendment. There was some litigation that showed that there was some disparity between the...City of Chicago and some of the suburban townships where there was a ten and five percent. The court held that the disparity...it had to be the same. So, the equity is that is...whether it's five percent, ten percent, it really becomes immaterial 'cause if you can't...you still need fifty-one percent to get elected and if you can't go out and get five percent or ten percent of the...the signators in your respective...political subdivision, I think you shouldn't even seek office. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Netsch wishes to speak for the second time.

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

You bet I do. Thank you. To make two points; one is that there...the number of registrants waivers as much as the number of people who voted in an election because every time you have an election, you have reregistration. So it is no more stable a base against which to measure the required number of signatures than measuring it against the number of people who voted in a given election which, in fact, is a more stable figure, if you...if you want to really look at it that way. The second thing is that the whole idea of the court's decision is to reduce the...the burden of having to...to get signatures to get onto the ballot for this office. Disparity is part of it. This will still produce

disparity. I would strongly suggest to you that this is going to be as vulnerable to court challenge as that provision which was already invalidated by the courts, because it puts this office and this office alone with a different base for measuring the number of required signatures, so I think it is...equally as vulnerable and it's bad as a matter of policy in addition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator...is there further discussion? Senator Macdonald for the second time.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

...I...I...certainly concur with Senator Netsch and I only ask that when the closing statements are made that we have a roll call on this vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As a township committeeman, I rise in support of Amendment No. 1, and quite to the contrary to what Judge Netsch just indicated, this provides an absolutely stable base. You're talking about registered voters, and the fact is that if you're going to run for a party office, the measure of the petitions ought to be measured against how many registered voters you have. I...I think it's a grand idea and I urge support for Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

A roll has been requested. Those in favor of adopting Amendment No. 1 will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 30, none voting Present. Amendment No. 1 having failed to receive a majority

vote is declared lost. Senator Kelly, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR KELLY:

Like to verify the negative votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

There's been a request for a verification of the negative vote. Will all the members please be in their seats and will the Secretary please read the negative roll.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The following voted in the negative: Barkhausen, Bloom, Coffey, Davidson, DeAngelis, Donahue, Dudycz...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Would you slow that down, Mr. Secretary. Senator Kelly is having a hard time hearing. Will there be order...

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

...Dunn, Etheredge, Fawell, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Hudson, Karpel, Keats, Kustra, Macdonald, Mahar, Maitland, Netsch, Newhouse, Philip, Rigney, Rupp, Schaffer, Schuneman, Sommer, Topinka, Watson, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

(Machine cutoff)...Senator Kelly, do you question any of the negative votes?

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay, Coffey.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is Senator Coffey in his seat? He's standing here at the Podium.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator Davidson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is Senator Davidson in his seat? Senator Davidson? Strike his name from the record.

SENATOR KELLY:

...Senator Bloom.

HB 217
2nd Reading

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom is standing at the end of the aisle.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator Dudycz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Dudycz is standing in the back.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen is in his seat.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Fawell in her seat? She's in the back with Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR KELLY:

And Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman? Senator Schuneman on the Floor? Strike his name from the record.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay, that's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman has returned to the Floor. On a verified roll call, there are 27 Ayes, 29 Nays and the motion...the amendment fails. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 217, Senator Kustra. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 217.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 272, Senator Lenke. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 272.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary I offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What we do is we're...we're...make this bill purely revisory and add...and add certain sections that the...apparently the revisory commission didn't feel were important. Number one, what we're doing is adding back Section 2 which requires an attorney to be a U.S. citizen and to file a certificate of...that he's of good moral character with the circuit court; and two, we're adding Section 7 and 8 back which permits a client to petition the Supreme Court to have any monies...any...any...attorney's name stricken from the master roles of attorney when the client contends that the attorney has wrongfully withheld monies from the client. I think these are important...proceedings to have reputable lawyers in the State and I don't think we should be eliminating these, and I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lenke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 272. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it.

HB 314
2nd Reading

Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 296, Senator Bloom. House Bill 300, Senator Rock. House Bill 314, Senator Karpziel. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 314.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Karpziel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I'm sorry, did you say the committee amendment?...the committee amendment added all municipalities into the bill not just home room...home rule.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Karpziel moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 314. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Karpziel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Karpziel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I would like to withdraw Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Amendment No. 2...Senator Karpziel seeks leave to withdraw Amendment No. 2. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. Senator Karpziel, for what purpose do you arise?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Karpziel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

There was...there was another amendment.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I should have two Floor amendments there, Amendment No. 2 and...yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

We are still on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, 314, Amendment No...Committee Amendment No. 1 was adopted...Amendment No. 2 was withdrawn and now we have one other amendment...

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...which...is be offered.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Would be Amendment No. 2 again. Oh, I see...thank you. Amendment No. 2 then says that a...a distiller, a person or a corporation that has ownership in a distillery and a retail business such as a hotel, motel or restaurant where the prin-

HB 316
2nd Reading

cipal business is not the sale of alcoholic beverages, that such corporation or person can own both...have ownership in both of those entities as long as they do not sell more than ten percent of the liquor sales...from their own distillery or the distillery in which they have ownership. This amendment is brought to me by the Governor's Office. It is approved by Jack Wallenda of the Liquor Commissioner...Commission, the Beer Distributors, the entire industry, I don't know of anyone that has any opposition to the amendment. They have all seen it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Karpel moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 314. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 316, Senator Sangmeister. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 316.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Sangmeister.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sangmeister on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Amendment No. 1 merely changes the retroactive date and brings it up to the date that the bill would become effective if it became law which would be January 1st, 1986. I move

the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Sangmeister has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 316. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 348, Senator Kustra. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, middle of page 54, is House Bill 348. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 348.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 354, Senator Kelly. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 354. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 354.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary II offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1...this is on the stun gun, basic-

ally makes House Bill 354 a duplicate of Senate Bill 144 which passed out of this Chamber. It merely prohibits persons under twenty-one from purchasing this weapon and it increases the penalty. Other than that, it's the same bill that we had approved earlier.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Kelly has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 354. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. If I can have the attention of the Body, we have a very special guest with us today from Sangamon County and I would ask Senator Davidson to introduce this young lady.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Thank you, President Rock. It's my privilege to present to the members of this Senate the Miss Illinois County Fair Queen, Miss Cathy Forgas and I want you people to know that you are now in the land of beauty. Cathy happens to be the third Miss County Fair Queen from Sangamon County. We've had this chance...this queen for the last...three out of the last four years, and it's my great privilege to present to the Illinois Senate Miss Cathy Forgas from Springfield. Cathy.

MISS COUNTY FAIR QUEEN CATHY FORGAS:

(Remarks made by Queen Cathy Forgas)

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

HB 394
2nd Reading
HB 381
2nd Reading

Thank you, Cathy. I'd like to...also present to the Senate, Mr. Merle Miller, the superintendent of the Illinois State Fair. Merle. Mr. Useman, president of the Illinois Association of County Fairs from Morrison, Illinois. Mr. Useman.

MR. USEMAN:

(Remarks made by Mr. Useman)

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

And also the lady who didn't want to be introduced, the proud mother of the queen, Mrs. Forgas. Thank you, very much, and we'll be looking forward to seeing all of you at your own county fairs and at...also the Illinois State Fair where Cathy will be spending the ten days presiding as the queen and we'll be looking forward to seeing each and every one of you there. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

All right, back on page 54. Middle of page 54, 381, Senator Barkhausen. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 381. Read the bill, Mr Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 381.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 392, Senator Lemke. 394, Senator Carroll. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 394. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 394.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

7/13 513
2nd Reading

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 481, Senator Kelly. 483. 510, Senator Poshard. 513, Senator Poshard. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, top of page 55, is House Bill 513. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 513.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Poshard on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 would exclude the building of signs by DOT for the purposes of advertising along interstate highways that are toll highways. Move for...adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Poshard has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 513. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 514, Senator Kustra. 521, Senator

HB 571
2nd Reading

Barkhausen. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 521. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 521.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 548, Senator Kustra. 556, Senator Marovitz. 558, Senator Bloom. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 558. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 558.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 571, Senator Hall. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 571. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 571.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Revenue offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hall on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to 571...it provides that no person who is a member of a board of assessors or assessors or a supervisor of assessors or an employer thereof may serve as a hearing officer. Now what happened in St. Clair County, after forty years, they finally had a reassessment and during that time, there were thirty-five thousand complaints. Now, there are only three members of the board of assessors, so they had no way of accommodating all these people, they were standing out in the weather and all; so what they did, they took some people who work in that department and had them sit and take down the complaints. Keep in mind, still the board of assessors had to review these complaints. Now, what happened was that the Revenue Committee, in their wisdom, saw fit to put this amendment on which makes sense, it's to say that these people who are doing this could not work in the board of assessor's office. So, this is a good amendment and I will accept this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Hall has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 571. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This follows up what Senator

Hall was just talking about in regard to these...these hearing officers, and what we're trying to do is simply say that the hearing officer must have the same qualifications as those individuals who serve on the board of review and those qualifications, of course, would be experience and they have to take an examination and a test. He is quite correct and we certainly support Amendment No. 1, but we think Amendment No. 2 will help clear up any other concerns that might be generated from St. Clair County, and I move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 571. Discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition...this amendment. Now, what has happened is that we never expect to get back into the situation again 'cause we certainly don't expect to go forty years without a reassessment. Now, what Senator Watson's amendment would do would give the people who sit out there and take the complaints the same power as members of the board of review. Now, that county can only afford...we only have three. So, therefore, if we put the qualifications of everyone they had sitting there, then they would become members of the boards of assessment...or the boards of review and there's no way that we can have that. These people simply accommodate the people, take down their complaints, take down all the information but still the three members of the board of review have to act on each and individual case. So, therefore, I move for...that we defeat this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President. Senator Watson, I really don't think that the amendment is necessary. I...what we are doing now with the committee amendment on is providing for an emergency circumstance. I think Senator Hall has already indicated this and I'm sure the committee would echo it, that we hope that it will never happen again not only in his county but in any other county. If it does, though, you are not going to have the time nor the resources, really, to comply with what I think is implied in your amendment. It seems to me that the most troublesome thing that the bill as originally proposed did was to allow the possibility of, in a sense, a conflict of interest. We have removed that, I believe, by the committee amendment which Senator Hall has now put on and...and I think what you've done is just simply complicate a matter and make it impossible to do what the bill was originally designed to do. So, I would hope that the amendment would not be put on the bill.

PRESIDENT:

All right, question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Any further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close?

SENATOR WATSON:

No, just roll call. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

All right, question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 571. Those in favor of the amendment will vote Aye...I beg your pardon. Oh, all in favor of the adoption of the amendment indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The opinion of the Chair, the Noes have it. The amendment fails. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: {MR. FERNANDES}

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 574, Senator Netsch. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 574. Read the bill, Mr.

Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 574.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elections offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

There should be two committee amendments. Well, let me...that may be a little confusing. There were two offered and I'm sure adopted in committee. The first one...both of the committee amendments...

PRESIDENT:

Well, can we...you want to...you want to take it out of the record while they check?

SENATOR NETSCH:

Let's do that and find out.

PRESIDENT:

All right, with leave of the Body, we'll take it out of the record. We'll check. There may have...well have been a clerical error. We'll get back to it. 615, Senator Maitland. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, the bottom of page 55, is House Bill 615. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 694, Senator Degnan. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, the top of page 56, is House Bill 694. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 694.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Degnan.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Degnan on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 694 is a substantive bill that funds the Cook County State's Attorney Appellate Division. Amendment No. 1 places that process under the jurisdictions of DCCA and reduces the amount involved. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Degnan has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 694. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Lechowicz on 706. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Mr. President, I would like to call a caucus immediately in your office.

PRESIDENT:

All right the gentleman has requested a Democratic Caucus immediately in the Office of the President. Senator Schaffer, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

A similar request for the Republicans in Senator Philip's Office.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the Senate will stand in Recess for approximately thirty minutes for a Republican and Democratic Caucus in the office of the leadership, immediately. The Senate stands in Recess.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will come to order. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 380 offered by Senator Macdonald. It's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 381 offered by Senator Poshard. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 382 offered by Senators Kelly, Hudson and Lemke.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolutions, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolution 76. It's congratulatory. And House Joint Resolution 75 is a death resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. All right, with leave of the Body, we'll return where we left off, on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, the top of page 56. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 706. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 706.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Lechowicz, Lenke, Degnan, Marovitz, Zito and Kelly.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 would make it illegal to operate, register or maintain...register an...uninsured vehicle or, as plainly understood, the mandatory insurance plan for automobiles in the Illinois. Let me just briefly preface that this subject matter has been before the General Assembly for the past ten years. This subject matter has also passed the House for the past good number of years, it even passed this Body...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, pardon me, Senator Lechowicz. For what purpose do you arise, Senator Jones?

SENATOR JONES:

Mr. President, has this amendment been distributed? I

don't have it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz, has...has this amendment been distributed? The...Senator Jones has...all right, the Secretary has indicated that he has the copies here and if we can just get some Pages down here in front, we will momentarily have this amendment distributed. All right, Senator Kelly, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR KELLY:

While were waiting for the amendment to be distributed, I'd like to request leave to have immediate consideration on Senate Resolution 392 which was just assigned to the Executive Committee. This is the annual Right-to-Life Respect Week Resolution which has been adopted almost unanimously...by this Body for the last ten years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Well, Senator Kelly, we...were not there yet. If you could just hold that for a few minutes, we will momentarily be to that order of business. I am told now that the amendment has now been distributed. Channel 20 has requested permission to...to tape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of...House Bill 706, Amendment No. 1. Senator Lechowicz, you may proceed.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 would provide mandatory automobile insurance to the people of Illinois for any vehicle that is presently operated or registered to make sure that they have a...just a basic, minimum amount of liability coverage in the amount of fifteen to thirty thousand dollars for personal injury and ten thousand dollars for property damage. The Secretary of State would require every person applying for registration will have to sign an...an affirmation that the vehicle being registered is insured and furnish to the Secre-

tary of State the name of the insurance company. Every insurance company upon receiving a premium payment will issue an insurance card to the vehicle owner or leasee making the payment. The form and contents of the insurance card will be...be prescribed by Rosemary Galatians of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will investigate applications for registration selected at random to verify the insurance information. Any police officer who stops a vehicle for another traffic violation may request to see the driver's insurance card. If the driver cannot furnish a card, he or she may be ticketed; however, the case will be dismissed if at a court hearing the driver presents evidence that the vehicle was insured at the time the driver was ticketed. The penalties for the first violation would be a three-month suspension of a driver's license and vehicle registration and proof of financial responsibility for the future prior to reinstatement. If the violation involves the operation of an uninsured vehicle, the penalty also includes the minimum two hundred and fifty dollar fine. On a second violation, it would require a six-month suspension and a minimum fine of five hundred dollars. The following vehicles would be exempt: government owned vehicles, vehicles which transport passengers for compensation, for-rent vehicles, vehicles covered by certificates of self-insurance issued by the Department of Insurance and farm vehicles not subject to registration. Vehicles subject to greater liability insurance requirements under State laws will continue to be governed by those laws. Amendment No. 1 to 706 is basically a concept that has been discussed here in great detail. It's a concept that's also been reviewed by most of the major newspapers in this State. It has been endorsed by the Chicago Tribune, the Southern Illinoisan, the Waukegan Times. Papers throughout this State have reviewed the concept of mandatory automobile insurance that is being presented this year in a dual differ-

ent light than it has in the past, and the difference is, how do you prove...how do you prove a person has automobile insurance by the Secretary of State? Under the previous system that was proposed, they thought it'd be too cumbersome and too costly to verify. Under this program, when a person pays his premium, the insurance company issues an insurance card to that individual saying that he has automobile insurance on such and such vehicles and he would be asked to carry that on his person or persons, and in turn,...the verification of that procedure would be up to the individual police officer or the random sampling by the Secretary of State's Office. I believe this concept...if you take a poll of the people of the State of Illinois, nine out of ten people have the...responsible answer in stating that if you have an automobile...you purchase an automobile, you purchase your license plates, you should also purchase the basic, minimum in insurance coverage, and that's what Amendment No. 1 does. It doesn't provide for any exorbitant amount of insurance, its cost...it's asking for fifteen, thirty in liability insurance and ten thousand in medical; and I believe it provides for the safeguards that have been requested both by the Secretary of State and, yes, by the membership of both bodies of the General Assembly in protecting the motoring public in making sure that everybody who has an automobile in Illinois would comply as they have in thirty-two other states where mandatory insurance is on the books. Thirty-two other states have this law in effect, and I've heard the Naysayers say, well, that won't reduce you insurance premiums. Yes, it will and it will from the standpoint that everybody will have insurance...I believe it will also make sure that if you are involved in an accident, you don't have to go against your own insurance company on uninsured motorist provisions. There may be some adjustment in rates, but I think in fairness and in equity this concept, this law, is long overdue in Illi-

nois. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions at this time, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, we have several speakers but before we get into that, WCIA-TV has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. I have the following speakers thus far, Rupp, Lemke, Collins and Kelly. Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. Basically, in addition to the bill being one which does not have too much merit, this is another attempt, I think, to circumvent our committee system. Committee Chairman Jones set a specific time to accommodate some of the folks interested in this bill. It's my understanding that they didn't even give the courtesy to show up, did not give the courtesy to Chairman Jones that they were not going to show up. The sponsor of the bill didn't show up. As a result, the...the schedule that Senator Jones had arranged was disturbed. We did not have enough bills that day to handle when we thought we had time...were giving time for this particular bill. The bill did have two hearings and I think the chairman should be commended for his tact and patience in handling the circumstances at that time. Our esteemed Secretary of State has come out...and in the local paper I saw one indication where he said that appearing before our Insurance Committee characterized by Senator Edgar as the biggest stacked deck you can go against. I think he should recognize a big stacked deck like that on a committee thing because he appeared before the Senate...the House committee...and the House committee in order to get this bill out last year, five members who were going to vote No on this bill were taken off the House Committee; this year, three members were taken off the House committee because it was known they were going to vote No. That's the only way they

got this bill out and I think toying in...in that arena, as far as any bill is concerned, to me is enough to make it a No vote. One of the things I think that should be pointed out is that this bill is...the claims that are being made for it...evidently are not quite...they're not convinced themselves because the bill itself requires that all the policies that are still issued have an amendment in there or coverage for uninsured motorist. They're still going to require you to carry the uninsured motorist. It shows that they themselves, I believe, do not have too much confidence. Secretary of State Edgar in a TV broadcast indicated that there were twenty percent plus uninsured motorists in the State of Illinois and that if they could get it down to a ten percent figure, that would be his goal, that would be his ideal. Well, we have some figures too and those figures came from the Department of Transportation and they are the ones that get the records of the accidents, and lo and behold, we are already...we already have met our goal that we're four hundred and sixty some odd thousand accidents of which forty-nine thousand were deemed and certified as uninsured, that's 10.6. If we already have our goal, I wonder why we're going to go through all this procedure in order to make the change. I do...I think and this is a very personal note and I'm sorry to say it, but most of you people on this Floor have come to me and ask me for a vote at one time or other. I very seldom have come back to you people. I'm coming now and in that regard, I ask for a No vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? The following speakers have also been added, Hall, Chew, Jones and Schuneman. We will begin to use the timer. Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I rise in...I rise in support of this amendment. It's a very simple amendment. It says to the people in the State of

Illinois that if you want to drive an automobile, which we construe as a privilege, you must have financial responsibility. The people that are paying the premiums in my area are tired of seeing...getting hit by people that are not insured. This is...this bill ends the free lunch in Illinois. If you want to drive, then you must be responsible and come up with the cash. You can put up your bond...you don't have to buy insurance, you can be self-insured if you want to, but this says one simple thing...sure, we have uninsured motorist and underinsured motorist, but what about the little lady that doesn't have an automobile in her house? She doesn't have any coverage and I had this happen to my late mother when she was hit. She ended up paying something like fifteen thousand dollars in medical bills and there was no insurance. It's too bad, but she couldn't come under any other coverage of an automobile and there was no way she could collect on her uninsured motorist. These people are there and they're...most of them are our senior citizens that...have this mishap. I think it's time now to pass this bill, and as far as raising in premiums, there's still going to be the same number of drivers in Illinois and the insurance premiums are based on the number of drivers not on the number of insureds, and I'd ask for an Aye vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor of the bill, and...are you the sponsor of the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor of the amendment? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

No, I...I'm interested in the sponsor of the bill because I...I want to know...I...I thought that I had an opportunity to prepare an amendment for this bill and I see that

the...the sponsor is moving forward and I just...would like to know whether or not I would have an opportunity to put the...the equalization amendment on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, the...the Calendar, in fact, does indicate that Senator Lechowicz and Senator Lemke are the sponsors. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. The lady mentioned the same provision in the caucus and at that time I responded. I have no objection in supporting her concept in a bill. This bill has been on the Calendar. I've filed the amendment with the Clerk, I think it was last Friday and I don't intend on holding this bill anymore or putting anything else on it. I'll be more than happy to support your endeavor on a different piece of legislation. I think it's a separate issue and should be discussed as such.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise...in very strong opposition to this amendment. I...I realize what the sponsor is trying to do and I realize that the concept of mandatory insurance is not an all bad concept; however, we cannot sit here and pretend that the problem is...will be resolved in relationships to insurance...automobile insurance once we make it compulsory in the State of Illinois. Now, I realize that we...there have been a lot of publicity and...and a lot of media support for this piece of legislation; unfortunate, the media don't always look at problems in depth. If we proceed without having the equalization amendment so that people can across this State obtain insurance at fair rates, then we would have done a disservice to a substantial amount...number...of the popu-

lation of State of Illinois and we would most certainly compound the unemployment problem, because there are many people who have to rely on their automobiles as a means of transportation. None of us here could, in fact, support people driving automobiles and having accidents, destroying people's property and people's lives without adequate automobile insurance protection. I would like to see that protection as well as anyone else here, but at the same time, if that protection is going to exist, then people should have equal and fair access to automobile insurance. The amendment that I would like offer would provide for that protection and I think that we should defeat this bill...this amendment until such time that we're willing to do that, and I...I, too, don't ask for very much, but this is one thing that probably is one of the most important issues to me down here and if you want my cooperation and votes, I say, vote against this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I also rise to support Senator Lechowicz on his amendment, and I took a survey up about two months ago on this issue and it indicated that more than eighty percent of my constituents favor mandatory insurance, and I think the principal benefits from this program are that it'll build character. It'll help to eliminate a lot of the careless attitude that's out in the streets right now when you drive your...your vehicle. It'll help to teach respect for other motorists, and so what if it costs more money in premium rates, I don't think it will, but if it does cost a little more, that won't have any...any big impact on it because I think the people are aware that they want this, not only in Illinois but across the nation, and I just...commend Senator Lechowicz for sponsoring this and urge

your support of his amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator...Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Before I speak to the bill, I would ask if the sponsor might yield to a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Yeah. Senator Lechowicz, are you amenable if this does get on to bring the bill back so that I may place an amendment on it or attempt to place an amendment on it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I'll be more than happy to look at the amendment at the appropriate time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

If I've ever heard something that was not a complete answer, I...I...I asked you a question. Are you, I'll repeat, amenable to bring the bill back to 2nd reading so that I may attempt to place an amendment on the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, AP has requested leave to photograph. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I thought I answered the question and maybe you didn't understand me and it's maybe my fault. Based upon what the amendment does, I would...make that determination whether to bring it back from 3rd to 2nd at that time. I can't tell you exact...I don't know what

your amendment intends on doing or what it does, and to ask me that type of question, I don't believe it's even germane now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

My amendment is simply this, that we have an equalization clause put in the...that's what I want to talk to you about. That's what I had. Now, I want to know yes or no on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

It's basically the same question that Senator Collins asked me. I told her I would support that concept in a bill but not as an amendment to this bill. My answer would be no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall, your time has almost expired. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

May I have a little quite, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Can we have some order, please. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

This is going to be a travesty to place an amendment like this on here and where...if you do not have that, that means that in many areas throughout this State that people will not be able to get proper insurance from some of the major companies. There's locations in this State where...that many of those companies have moved out. That forces other people to go to substandard companies, they pay a very high rate of principle, these are usually people on the low rung of the ladder that kind of...it's easy to say what about...if the premiums are higher. Yes, if you got money, but the thing is in this great State, and even in this great country, we're

supposed to be looking out for the welfare of not just a few, we're supposed to be looking out for the welfare of all. Mandatory insurance, great, but if it doesn't apply to all people equal, then it's not. This is a bad amendment, it should not go on; and what I'm simply saying and if you heard what the sponsor is saying right here now, I wanted to know and he has not...he says that if he doesn't like what the amendment says, he will not bring the bill back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well.

SENATOR HALL:

It's common courtesy around here to always...if a person has an amendment, if he has enough votes to put the amendment on, I'm sure you'd have enough votes to defeat the amendment, but at this time with the high rate and what people are paying throughout this State, many of them are paying four and five times what other people who move into your city, in and out, work in there, live out in other areas and their rate is one-fourth as high as you when their cars are in your city all the time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall, can you bring your remarks to a close please?

SENATOR HALL:

I very seldom take any time up here, Mr....Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm attempting to be fair to all.

SENATOR HALL:

..and what simply saying, this is a very, very important issue here and it should be given a consideration that this is not the proper way to go. If we're going to do this, it should be where it affects all people equally throughout this entire State. I urge a No vote on Amendment 1 to House Bill 706.

Page 89 - June 19, 1985

END OF REEL

REEL #3

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we have six additional speakers. We have...a long way to go today, so...Senator Chew.

SENATOR CHEW:

Thank you, Mr. President, maybe I can make up for all six. Senator Jones, don't get upset about the committee system. The first year I was here, I found out that the committee system was for the privileged and you don't fit under that category. People with power get what they want with or without a committee system. The committee system is merely a time-taker and to have you parade yourself around as its chairman to only...be defeated on things that were fairly heard that you felt were dead. So don't get excited about that, just try to pass the kind of legislation you can and that that you can't, don't lose any sleep on it; because unless you belong to the privileged few, you are basically a nonentity. Now I would suggest to Governor Thompson who is supportive of mandatory insurance that I would gladly support the concept and the amendment if he were to issue an Executive Order equalizing the rates in the State of Illinois. So if you lived in a zip code that was twenty in Chicago or one that was 606 or 706 in Springfield that we would have the right to purchase insurance at the same rate. Apparently the Governor has not allowed this to come into his memory because maybe no one has brought it to his attention. Well, now, Governor, you know why I do not support the amendment is because you, as chief executive of this State, has not seen fit to get these insurance companies in line and for me who live in Chicago would have the same rate that you who might live in Springfield. Now, I don't have any qualms with

the sponsor of the bill or the amendment that he's attempting to put on the bill, that's his right, I have no problems with that. I have no problems with you not holding the bill. You are a supporter of the amendment, I'm not, but I have no qualms with that. All I ask of you and each one of us that share in this building that would consider how discriminatory insurance is today and to consider how discriminatory it will be on a forced issue once this becomes law. And I would ask you, as my fellow legislators, to once in your life consider the kind of disaster it's going to mean for some of the persons that cannot afford that excessive premium that will be placed on them...once this amendment becomes a part of the bill and the bill is signed into law. You will continue to pay your uninsured premium because this kind of legislation can never be enforced. The Secretary of State who is a very good friend of mine, I support most of his legislation, I have no problems with that, but he knows it cannot be enforced, we know it cannot be enforced. If it's a help for someone politically, so be it, I have no problems with that. All I ask of you is to consider how whopsided the premiums are going to be and how you going to drive some people who would like to have insurance completely on the ground and they will drive those cars and suffer the consequences. We've all had accidents so it's no...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...

SENATOR CHEW:

...privilege to have an accident, nor do you fit in a special class.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Chew, can you bring your remarks to a close, please.

SENATOR CHEW:

Yes, I will. But the point is, when we have accidents we

want those persons involved to be insured, but how can you ask one person to pay a five hundred dollar premium for the same amount of insurance and the other person to pay a two hundred dollar premium? Mr. Governor, I beg of thee to issue that order and equalize these premiums, and I'll support the concept and I'll support the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's interesting to me that this...that this discussion on the bill has already taken a turn that I predicted would not happen for a year or so. What we're hearing is a demand that we equalize rates in Illinois. Now if you live in suburban Cook County or in one of the counter...counties or in downstate Illinois, I...I suggest to you that your constituents would not be very happy if you equalized rates in Illinois. If this bill passes, this is the kind of complaint that we're going to hear for the next ten years. The argument will be, the State says we must have insurance; therefore, the State must make it affordable. Now there are people on this Floor who agree with that concept and I understand why you do, but the fact of the matter is that the great majority of people that the rest of us represent do not live in those areas where accidents are with such high frequency and where claims are so high. We don't want to pay...we don't want to pay for your bills but that will be the next shoe to drop if this bill passes. Now the argument has been made that since other states have mandatory insurance, somehow we ought to have it here in Illinois. If you'll check with those states you'll find that not everybody in those states has insurance. There is no foolproof mandatory insurance law anywhere in this nation. There are people running around in everyone of those states without insurance and there will be in Illinois.

There will still be uninsured drivers in Illinois. So for the responsible driver who now buys insurance and tries to protect the public, what's the effect going to be on him? We'll, first of all, he's not going to be able to drop any of his current uninsured or underinsured motorist coverage. He has to have that coverage to protect himself, because the guy who hits him is not guaranteed to be insured under any of these bills. So he will not reduce his premium. The other thing that's going to happen is that there are some people who are uninsured now who probably are uninsurable; they really have terrible driving records and any insurance company that insures them is going to have an increase in losses. Those losses are going to be spread over all the policies that those companies write in the State of Illinois. That's how your premium is going to go up under this provision. I suggest to you that...I remember a number of years ago our friend Bernie Epton commented about a bill that was being heard in the House that he and I both thought were sort of...was sort of ridiculous, and he made a statement to me that I always remembered; and he said, you know, when it comes to insurance legislation, it's a whole lot more fun if you don't know anything about the subject. And I suggest to you that that's exactly the position that most of us are put in here today. We know that people support the idea that other folks ought to be responsible. Senator Lenke said that all this bill does is require that people have...financial responsibility. Well, we've already got a law that says that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator, can you bring your remarks to a close, please.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

...and the Governor and the Secretary of State under both Walker and Dixon and Thompson and Edgar, nobody has done a very good job of enforcing that law. So...we're going to be

right back in the situation of having another law which won't be enforced and won't work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? New lineup, Jones, Marovitz, Kustra, Berman and Newhouse. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. In response to my esteemed colleague, Senator Chew, let it be said that I know how the...the privileged few get what they want...only way...only way they get what they want is we give it to them. And if the...if the privileged few is going to take these means, then the privileged few would not get what they want because they would not be in power to do so. Will the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Lechowicz,...on your compulsory mandated insurance...amendment, do your bill compel insurance companies to write insurance in all sections of the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

No, it doesn't address that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

...on page 9 of the bill, line 12, you indicate in your amendment that...any person who owns a vehicle or any person operating the vehicle. If I were to drive your car and I didn't have proof that you had insurance, what would happen to me?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr...Senator Jones, page 9, line 12, reads as follows, "Proof of...proof of insurance shall be carried in the vehicle or by the person operating the vehicle and shall be displayed upon request by any law enforcement officer wearing a uniform or displaying a badge or other sign of authority." And, basically, if you...then they...if you did not carry...or not have your...proper form, your insurance card with you, you'd...be issued a ticket. And if you...if you went into court and you had your insurance card and proved that...the automobile was insured, the matter would be dismissed. If you were proven guilty, for the first offense you'd...your license would be suspended for three months and could possibly...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator...wait a minute. Senator Jones...

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

...get a two hundred and fifty dollar fine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JONES:

Senator, that's not the question that I asked you. The question that I asked you, it was...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz, state your point.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Point of order, Mr. President. You...Senator Jones, you mentioned page 9, line 12 of the amendment, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Let me restate the question. If I were driving a vehicle that did not belong to me...and I was stopped by a police officer and asked me to show proof of insurance and...and the

person that's the owner of the vehicle did not give me such or did not have it placed in the car, would I receive a citation as such?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Yes, you would.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Okay, back to the amendment and...as it relate to this bill. Number one, the previous speaker had pointed out the ills as they relate to this amendment. The concept may sound good, but as this bill is drafted, it's unworkable. Insurance rates as far as liability insurance should be based on one's driving record not on the location where they reside. Any resident of the City of Chicago, for example, witnessed the heavy volume of traffic that is poured into the city be it the Eden's, be it the Eisenhower, be it the Stevenson, be it the Dan Ryan Expressway pour into the city. That heavy increase of traffic increases the probability of accidents. They live out of the city, the people are penalized as such. Your constituency, Senator Lechowicz, rates would go up as a result of this and they should not be penalized. The Senate President just because he lives in Oak Park but works in Chicago and drives in Chicago and increases the probability of accidents will not be penalized but the people in the city would be penalized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Jones, can you bring your remarks to a close, please.

SENATOR JONES:

Under the previous amendment on the original bill, House Bill 800, you had a criminal penalty for a person's not show-

ing proof of liability insurance. I have never seen such a severe penalty. I don't believe you have the same penalty for a person that's convicted of drunk driving for the first offense, be that a criminal penalty. There is no way under God's green earth that this bill can work. You already stated that the insurance companies will not be compelled to write insurance throughout the State of Illinois. All this bill would do is give those second- and third-rate gyp companies an opportunity to rob and rape the poor citizens of this State just for the sake of a dollar, and we on this side of the aisle who always express concern for the people intend to put this type of legislation out. It is disgusting, it should never been heard and I praise the President of the Senate for not doing what they did in the House because the bill would never got out of the House committee had not members have been taken off the committee but the Senate President would not permit such an act, give him compliments for that; but by the same token, this is disgusting legislation, it is not in the best interest of the people, and it should be resoundly defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Well, as the chief sponsor of this bill in the Senate, House Bill 800, I have no problem with the...with the hearing that I got in...in the committee, no problem whatsoever, I have no complaints about that, and I...I mentioned to people and made it very public that this issue would come before the Body by an amendment to another bill. This issue has been around a long time. If other members of this Body wanted to correct this bill, wanted to offer an amendment, including the chairman of the committee, this issue has been around for years. And to come before this Body and say,

well, this isn't the form that the bill should be in, that's hypocrisy, this...this bill has been around for years. Draft it the way you want it, offer it to the Body, that's what's being done today. I haven't seen it being drafted by the chairman of the committee or anybody else. Well, this is the way the bill is here, we vote it up or down. That's the way the committee system works. I've seen a lot of bills come before this Body by amendment and by Conference Committee, important issues, medical malpractice, Build Illinois, education reform, by amendment, by Conference Committee. Just because it doesn't come out of the committee the pristine way, that has nothing to do with it, that's the process that we're involved in. This is an issue that's very involved and very important to all the people of the State of Illinois, not just the media. But this is about the citizens who care about this issue. The polls have said that over ninety percent of the people in the State of Illinois were for this issue. As far as enforcement goes, today, if anyone of us wanted to go get a driver's license, we would have to go get a driver's license and drive. If we didn't want to get a driver's license and we wanted to drive an automobile without a driver's license, anybody in the State of Illinois could drive a car without a driver's license until you get caught, until you get caught. Okay? As far as enforcement goes, there will be random sampling; you'll be checked when you get stopped for a driving violation or for a automobile accident. Thirty-two other states have this legislation, none of those states have repealed their mandatory insurance laws, it's on the books. The insurance companies will tell you that the rates are going to increase. Ladies and gentlemen, the day after this bill got turned down in committee, the insurance rates increased in this State regardless of this bill. So to say that the insurance rates are going to increase if you pass this, that's a specious argument. Insurance rates for

automobile insurance have been going up with or without...mandatory automobile insurance. If people can afford the cost of a car, the cost of upkeep of a car, the cost of putting gasoline in a car, then they can certainly afford the minimum cost to make sure that they have insurance and that everyone else in the State of Illinois is safe and secure. No one is going to say and I'm not going to stand up here and say that this bill is going to get rid of all the one million or half a million uninsured motorists in the State of Illinois, that isn't going to happen, that's definitely not going to happen. But the fact is, it's going to make a dent. In Oregon it got rid of fifty percent of the people. It's going to get rid of a substantial number of uninsured motorists in the State of Illinois, and if it makes a dent and gets rid of a substantial number of uninsured motorists in the State of Illinois, isn't that what we're all about? Isn't that what this is all about? Ladies and gentlemen, this roll call is very important to the people of the State of Illinois, and I think it's part of the legislative process that an issue of great import, over ninety percent favorable in the State of Illinois, comes to the full Body and that people take a stand, yes or no, and that they...that the voters can take a look at the roll call and act accordingly. I would solicit an Aye vote for this very important bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? We have Senators Kustra, Berman, Maitland, Geo-Karis, Collins for a second time, and Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. After that list of names that you read off, I would like to move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Vadalabene has moved the pre-

vious...Senator...I'm sorry, Senator Rupp was also on the list. All right. Senator Vadalabene has moved the previous question with the names of those that the Chair has already read off. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The question has been...Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I'll try not to take too much time. I...I do think that Senator Schuneman, who spoke two or three speakers ago, summed up just about everything that I wanted to say. I...I would comment, however, on...on one aspect of this year's debate that I've noticed. In past years as we've debated this issue, it seems like those of us for and those of us against this issue have pretty much taken a stand based on what we thought were the merits of the bill, whether we thought the particular piece of legislation was going to work. This year what I am hearing more than ever before as I talk to individual members in the Senate and in the House is, well, my people back home want it to the tune of seventy-five percent, eighty percent of my folks want it, ninety percent of the polls say we ought to go for it. We've really reduced this issue to government by public opinion poll. And of all the issues which we discuss on the Floor of this Body, I'm convinced that this is one that simply cannot be reduced to that one-line question you send to the folks back home. I, like you, want to reflect my constituents' views, but I'm confident that if they were sitting here with the kind of information that I have, they simply couldn't see how this bill amounts to anything other than poor public policy. They don't see, for example, when you send your questionnaire back home, the experience in other states, that in 1957, 1957 the State of New York, which is an urban industrial state not unlike our own, adopted uninsured motorist protection. At

that time the percentage of motorists in New York was six percent driving without insurance coverage; it's up to twelve percent in 1984 after twenty-eight years of their trying to tinker with the law. The folks back home do not know that they will still need uninsured motorist protection and I think that's important because a lot of my people tell me that they don't like to pay that. Well, they're still going to need it under this bill, folks, because there's still going to be X number of people out there who won't be insured; so if you want to make sure that you're protected from them, you still need the uninsured motorist protection in addition, of course, to the increased insurance rates which I'm confident, in my neck of the woods anyway, suburban Cook County, we're going to pay. They fail to mention the inability of the State to enforce the existing Financial Responsibility Law. If we can't enforce that law, how are we going to turn around and enforce some newfangled law? The bottom line is that this bill isn't going to work. I am confident that I can construct a three-paragraph letter to my constituents and justify my...voting No on this bill and I'd be glad to help you out with that letter if you'd vote No. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. WEEK-TV, Channel 25, Kelly Morgan, has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I hope that you all listened carefully to Senator Schuneman and Kustra who have stated most of what I was going to say. Let me move on, however, and say that for all the years I've been here, and it's now seventeen, this bill has been up before committees that I have sat on almost every year and I have consistently voted No. I am sure if I went

out on the corners of my district and asked the people how they want it, if I ask them should there be compulsory insurance and everybody carry insurance, there is no doubt, over ninety percent, probably a hundred percent would say yes. If you gave them an honest question and said, are you willing to pay more so that somebody else has insurance, that statistic would drop dramatically, below fifty percent, I believe. The concept of insurance says this, the larger the...the group that you are insuring that has an adverse experience, the more you're going to have to pay for your insurance. Compulsory insurance is going to, by definition, include a less desirable risk element. High risk people are going to have to be included in that pool. That means all of you and me and all of our responsible citizen voters are going to have to pay more because we pass this bill. I don't think they're willing to do that. Number two, you're only mandating a fifteen thousand dollar coverage. This is economically discriminatory, let me tell you why. If you look at your own policy, and I've looked at mine, I carry, with a good insurance company, uninsured motorist coverage. I get three hundred thousand dollars of protection against an uninsured motorist that hits me. Three hundred thousand dollars coverage costs me thirty dollars a year, that's ten cents per thousand dollars it costs me. And everybody agrees you can't drop that even if I pass the bill. It only costs me ten cents per thousand. For the guy that's going to have to go out and buy this coverage with substandard companies, the minimum cost to him for only fifteen thousand dollars coverage in Chicago is going to be about a hundred and fifty dollars. It means it's going to cost them ten dollars a thousand for what it only costs me ten cents a thousand, that's not fair. And if it's not fair and it doesn't help the financially responsible people and it doesn't help the people that want to get fair responsive claim action and

they're willing to pay only ten cents a thousand for that, then this bill doesn't make sense. I agree with Senator Kustra and I agree with Senator Schuneman, every once in a while we are asked to take a tough political vote. A tough political vote means that we, upon our deliberations, have learned more about the issue than our voters do back home. That's this kind of bill. I suggest that you do what is politically courageous and economically correct, vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. One of the things that I've learned since I've been down here is from time to time we tend to do those things that we think are popular back home. I think Senators Berman, Schuneman and Kustra have really clearly given most of my speech. But I really...I really resent the fact that we use the...the questionnaire as that criteria by which we determine how we vote, especially on an issue like this. I am confident, too, as the other Senators have already alluded to the fact, that...that if we...we use that criterion and...and base our voting on that...on that...on that criterion, then, in fact, we are not doing judgment to our constituents. The fact of the matter is, here we have access to many more facts and figures with respect to this...this issue. I am confident that after I vote No on this bill and hopefully the bill is...is killed, I can go back to my constituency and proudly say to them, yes, I know, many of you think we should have mandatory insurance in Illinois; yes, many of you think everyone should have insurance in Illinois, I think so too, but this is not the way to do it. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I...I strongly urge you to oppose Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 706. All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. 6tf
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse, I would like to point out that the question...previous question has already been...raised. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

...Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I heard complaints that people were removed from the committee because they were against mandatory liability insurance. Well, I was removed from the committee because I had voted for it and that was a few years ago. I have been consistently in favor of mandatory liability insurance...automobile insurance, and let me give you one example. The people who are conscientious and who have a car that is maybe ten years old and they can't get any more coverage on their policy except public liability and property damage insurance but they're conscientious enough to carry it in case they hurt someone or...damage someone else's property, and then somebody smashes into them and makes their car a total wreck and their car is worth very little because in today's market it's a ten year old car. Are we thinking about those people? Let me give you another example, financial responsibility. I think the Secretary of State has done a good job with the financial responsibility law but the financial responsibility law only starts taking place when somebody hits another person and doesn't have insurance. Now, let me give you a third example. Supposing that somebody hits you and doesn't have insurance and suppose that you don't have insurance too, what happens? And, but...but supposing...if you don't have insurance and you're innocent, you still have to...financial responsibility, that wouldn't be fair either. I think this

bill is a step in the right direction and we have had here cited that there are states that haven't had success. Well, New York has had it since 1955, they still have it and friends of mine from New York have said to me, how come you don't have it? There are states in the south that have had it and they've experimented and they've improved it, and I think if we give this bill a chance for four years, we can see what the bugs are. I...I would say that it's high time to respect our constituency. And I can tell you my constituency, I have talked to them and said, it would raise your premiums; they say...they say, go ahead and raise them, at least we'll feel protected. I...speak in favor of the bill and I think it's a step in the right direction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Rupp, for a second time.

SENATOR RUPP:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. With the permission of the President, I would like to yield to Senator Newhouse since I have had one chance already at it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, there's been a request that Senator Rupp leave...yield to Senator Newhouse. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I desperately tried to stay out of this; you know my light went on, then my light went off, but there's one aspect of this I think does need to come out. Senator Schuneman, you hit it right on the head. If insurance...if the insurance theory is spreading the risk, then what we have instead of that is confining the risk in certain areas, and let me tell you what happens. In the City of Chicago, for example, the police live on the southwest side and the northwest side. The rates go up because people

steal automobiles and steal equipment. They don't steal them on the northwest side and the southwest side, they steal them wherever cops ain't, that's the logic one. And as a matter of fact, in certain areas, if you know the right people, you know how to get your automobile back. I have yet to hear a single insurance company insist that that kind of nonsense be rectified so that rates can be spread equitably. Yes, that is an issue. What you do is, when you have a large number of accidents at an intersection, you put up a stop light and you cut down on the numbers. Similarly, we could cut down on the loss ratio if we did something logical about what happens with theft rates, if we did something logical about what happens with accidents. The accidents in the City of Chicago aren't all accidents caused by those residents. Come there any day at eight o'clock in the morning and watch the cars pouring in off the super highways getting into the loop. Then go back at five o'clock and look at them pouring back out of the loop. That's the loss kind of ratio that we're having trouble with. It's unfair not to say this and not to have that exposed as part of the problem. If the rates were spread equitably, then Senator Collins would not be paying three times the premium that she would pay if she lived right across the street. It's insane, and because of that, to talk about mandatory insurance is completely unfair until and unless we address those inequities. Thank you for the time, Senator Rupp, I think this had to be said for us to get some kind of rational fix on what it is we're going to do. I oppose this bill and I would suggest everybody ought to oppose it simply on a fairness basis. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz may close.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I do appreciate the fact that there has been a lot of discussion on the issue of mandatory automobile insurance on this Floor; and, yes, it's been discussed previously for the past ten years and it's passed both Chambers at one time or another, but this...the difference this time is that there are thirty-two other states that have mandatory insurance. Mandatory insurance and no-fault is contained in the State of Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Utah. Now mandatory insurance alone is...mandated in the states of Arizona, California, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, West Virginia and Wyoming. Only eighteen states do not have this provision. Now is Illinois an exception? Is Illinois super special? Senator Schuneman pointed out as far as the compliance...of mandatory insurance...laws are made so that the majority of the people, hopefully, all the people will comply with the law. We passed a fifty-five mile an hour speed limit in this State based upon a Federal recommendation, and yes, it was very unpopular. And what other provisions; we have a Traffic Code which complies, if you break the speed limit within increments, certain...certain dispositions or fines are imposed upon the driving public. Same thing with this, but the Secretary and the Governor and the people that worked on this concept came in with a provision where it would be instead of a monetary fine only the possibility of a three-month suspension on the first offense is a very good reasoning point at getting people's attention to comply with this law. And if you continue to drive and are apprehended a second time, a six-month provision of...your driver's suspension is a very adequate way of getting your attention; and if

that doesn't, they can impose a fine up to five hundred dollars. I think that's the difference. May I also point out to you, another gentleman on the other side pointed out the number of insured cars in this State...or uninsured, and the information that I received from the Department of Insurance is that there are approximately five million eight hundred thousand cars registered in this State, approximately one million two hundred thousand registered trucks and buses...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz, would you bring your remarks to a close.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

...of that figure, one million are uninsured. That is the question, and that is the question that's been...addressed not only in this Chamber but by every one of the newspapers throughout this State; Southern Illinoisan, "Auto Insurance, Basic Responsibility;" Chicago Tribune, "Getting at the Deadbeats;" Waukegan, Sun Times...the New...New Times, "Mandatory Insurance, in Favor Of;" Elgin, Daily Courier,..."Mandatory Insurance, Legislation is Needed;" Beacon News, "Editorial Speaking;" Our Views, Danville, "Drive the Car, Pay the Freight;" "Mandatory Insurance, Legislation...Needed." These are the questions before you. It is not a City of Chicago issue or a suburban issue or a downstate issue, it's a State of Illinois issue whether we...we're going to be in compliance with twenty-two other states and making it a responsibility. That's the issue and that's why I offer Amendment No. 1. Encourage your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 706. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. Senator Lechowicz has requested a roll call. Senator Lechowicz moves the adoption of Amend-

ment No. 1 to House Bill 706. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 26, the Nays are 28, 1 voting Present. Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments? Senator Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Verify the negative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Lechowicz has requested a verification of the negative votes. Will all the members be in their seats. The Secretary will read the negative...the negative votes.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The following voted in the negative: Berman, Chew, Coffey, Collins, D'Arco, Demuzio, Donahue, Dunn, Hall, Hudson, Jones, Jerome Joyce, Karpel, Kustra, Luft, Macdonald, Maitland, Nedza, Newhouse, Philip, Rigney, Rupp, Sangmeister, Schaffer, Schuneman, Smith, Watson, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz, do you...question the...anyone who has voted in the negative?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Senator Hudson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hudson on the Floor? Senator Hudson on the Floor? Strike his name. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Senator Weaver is...I think it's Bloom sitting in front of him. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver is in his seat.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you...Hudson is back?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Hudson is back on the Floor, so restore his name. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Senator D'Arco.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco on the Floor? Is Senator D'Arco on the Floor? Strike his name.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Senator Kustra.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kustra on the Floor? Senator Kustra is on the Republican side.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I have no further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Mr. Secretary. All right. On that question, there are 26 Affirmatives, 27 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Amendment...Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Rupp.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

I'd like permission to withdraw that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Rupp withdraws Amendment No. 2. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 777, Senator Sangmeister. 793, Senator Luft. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you

have your light on? All right. 805...Senator Bloom, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BLOOM:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. As you know, there was a cake placed down by the press box on our side of the aisle yesterday. Well, there's another cake here today, and...it's not my birthday again, it's just that...some...yesterday Jerry Shea baked me a cake and today somebody else did and so you're all welcome to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

In other words, something is happening. 805, Senator Karpiel. 882, Senator Kelly. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 882, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 882.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elections offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This amendment is merely a clarifying amendment. It only identifies that the State political committee with voter dated tapes will only provide the information only if it's requested. It also provides for a reasonable fee if...if these tapes are requested from the State board. Other than that, I would move for your approval and ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 882. Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

HB 957
2nd reading

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 900, Senator Netsch. 935, Senator Fawell. 957, Senator Lechowicz. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 957, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 957.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1000, Senator Joyce. 1000. 1020, Senator Jeremiah Joyce. Page 57, 1027, Senator Welch. 1042, Senator Bloom. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1042, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1042.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1102, Senator Lemke. Well, we're on the Order of 2nd Reading and that's the amendment stages. House

HB 1104
2nd Reading

Bill 1102, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1102.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LEMKE:

Well, just hold that there. I think Senator Nedza has an amendment that he filed. I don't know where he's at. Where did Nedza go?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Mr. Secretary,...do you have an amendment? All right. With leave of the Body, we'll take it out of the record. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Take it out of the record. 1104, Senator Netsch. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1104, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1104.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elections offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Oh, yes, I'm sorry, I'd forgotten about the committee amendment. The...the bill deals with the procedures when supervisors of election are to be elected. It was not clear that...that we were not thereby authorizing it to happen under circumstances not otherwise provided for, that was cer-

HB 1109
2nd reading

tainly not our intention. And this is designed to make it clear that we are dealing only with the procedures when by other rules of law it is determined that the supervisors are to be elected. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1104.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Netsch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1104. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm sorry...any...any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1109, Senator Jerome Joyce. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1109, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1109.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lechowicz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz is not on the Floor. Senator...Senator Joyce, do you wish to handle...Senator Lechowicz on the Floor? Well, it's a Floor amendment. Senator Lechowicz is not on the Floor. Why don't we...all right...I am told he is enroute. All right. Senator Lechowicz on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I am sorry for the delay. Amendment No. 1 on House Bill 1109 would change the number of dates from...number of days required from thirty-five to twenty-eight. This amendment was requested by the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners and also our county clerk, and I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1109. Is there any discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I was...I would oppose this amendment. What it...I want the...the...everyone to have until twenty-eight days before the election, the deputy registrars as well as the county clerks and everyone else to be able to register people. What has happened is that there is a lot of confusion in many of our counties across this State where the deputy registrars can only...register people thirty-five days...up to thirty-five days' before the election and the county clerks can register them twenty-eight days before the election. And I would like that moved so that everything is...even and everybody gets to register people until twenty-eight days before the election. There was a lot of confusion in our areas and people were registering voters and then turned in the cards and...and...and found out that they could not...those people could not vote. And I think this would clear up the confusion. Consequently, I oppose this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz may close.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Basically, that may be fine as

far as if you've got a small election jurisdiction. But I can attest to you personally in reference to the City of Chicago in our area the difficulty that the election commissioner had in reference to the deputy registrar program. And basically all it does is say that after thirty-five days, we close the program. And I think it gives them an ample opportunity then to make sure that the people that were registered under the deputy registrar program are verified and checked and they're there, and it's also it...it would make it both...both for the county clerk and the Board of Election Commissioners in the City of Chicago...the...the date would be same and it would make their work load a little more reasonable. If you want to talk to some people that were deluged by this deputy registrar program and a number of people that they were coming through on that process, you would support this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Macdonald, Senator Lechowicz had closed. Do you wish to be recognized? Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Well, I...I only wanted to stand in support of his amendment. I think that it's a reasonable amendment and I think...now...I'm not so interested in the work with the county clerks and the boards of elections, I'm interested in being sure that those people who are registered by deputy registers are duly put into the books and are allowed to vote and, therefore, I...I support the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1109. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. Senator Joyce has requested a roll call. No....all right. In...the opinion of the Chair the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments? All right. Senator Joyce has now...requested a roll

*H.B. 1179
2nd reading*

call. Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1109. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Jerry. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 34, the Nays are 11, 1 voting Present. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1129, Senator Fawell. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1129, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1129.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1131, Senator Chew. Chew on the Floor? 1154, Senator Savickas. 1159, Senator Jerome Joyce. 1179, Senator Kelly. 1179? House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1179, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1179.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

*7/13/87
2nd Reading*

3rd reading. All right. Senator Savickas is on the Floor. 1154, is there leave to go back to that? Leave is granted. House Bill 1154, Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1154.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1187, Senator Luft. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1187, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1187.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Well, with leave of the Body, before we get too far away, Senator Chew is now on the Floor. With leave of the Body, we'll go back up and pick up 1131. Leave is granted. House Bill 1131, Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1131.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1132, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1132.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Bottom of page 57, House Bill...1193, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1193.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Top of page 58, 1197, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom on the Floor? 1202, Senator Jerome Joyce. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1202, Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1202.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Joyce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment brings this bill into exact accord that...of the Senate bill that we passed out of here dealing with Senate...solar energy that had no negative votes and I'd ask for its support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce moves the adoption of...Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1202. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 1217, Senator Degnan. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1217, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1217.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 by the committee on House Bill 1217 was an accommodation to the North Shore Sanitary District. I am led to believe that that accommodation has been resolved another way. I move to Table

Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Degnan has moved to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1217. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1249, Senator Degnan. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1249, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1249.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No...Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Degnan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1249 is clarifying in nature. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1249. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

HB 1318
2nd reading

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1251, Senator Poshard. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1251, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1251.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1284, Senator Chew. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1284, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1284.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1292, Senator Berman...House Bill 1318, Senator Kelly. House Bill 1318, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1318.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Kelly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This was more or less a request of the committee to have an amendment. It referred to towing service rather than to a towing company. Other than that, it was a...an agreed amendment. And I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly moves the adoption of...Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1318. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1355, Senator Sangmeister. Senator Sangmeister, 1355? 1378, Senator Netsch. House bills 2nd reading, bottom of page 58, House Bill 1378, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1378.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Page 59, 1382, Senator Poshard. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1382, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1382.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. In drafting this bill, Section 4-5-11 of the Illinois Municipal Code which relates to specifications, bids and awards of contracts over fifteen hundred dollars was inadvertently omitted and this amendment simply includes that paragraph in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1382. Any discussion? Senator Etheredge. Your light is on, sir. Any discussion? If not, Senator Poshard has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1389, Senator Netsch. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1389, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1389.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

HB 1392
2nd Reading

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1392, Senator Netsch. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1392, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1392.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Netsch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1, which is the longer amendment I trust, Mr. Secretary, the one that ends...2483ESPF, right. This amendment incorporates some seven changes in the basic bill. This is the Illinois parentage law. All of these changes have been reviewed by staff, by the chairman of the committee and the minority spokesman. And I think it can...they can fairly be described as reasonably technical in...couple of cases, for example, they reinsert provisions which were inadvertently left out of the Conference Committee report last Session when this bill was initially passed. In one case, it clarifies what might otherwise be thought of as a conflict with the Probate Act. In another case, it sets forth the procedure for enforcing a judgment of child support, and the procedure is exactly word for word that which is already incorporated in the Marriage and Dissolution Act. I don't know that I need to describe all of the others in exact detail. I think there is no controversy that I am aware of about any of the provisions and they are...essentially clean-up amendments to the Illi-

nois Parentage Act. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1392.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Netsch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1392. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Right. Amendment No. 2 is designed to give the presumed father the right to notice and that was missing from the parentage bill. The language is similar to the same rights which are given to fathers who have adopted a child. Again, I don't believe there is any dispute about the relevance of this amendment and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1392. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3.

SENATOR BERMAN:

...3...clarifies that the...if there is an action brought by either the mother or the purported father that the two-

year Statute of limitation will not bar a defense to the...to the bringing of a cause of action regarding parenthood. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman has moved the adoption of...Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1392. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1395, Senator Nedza. Senator Nedza on the Floor? 1436, Senator Jerome Joyce. 1438, Senator Collins. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1438, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1438.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1445, Senator Luft. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1445, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1445.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to begin by moving to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. What I will do with the Floor amendment is to add everything in that was in Committee No. 1...Amendment No. 1 and then elaborate on that a little bit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Luft moves to Table Committee Amendment...No. 1 to House Bill 1445. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 permits the Department of Corrections' teachers to select...elect to be members of the State Employees' Retirement System so as to be eligible for the benefits of corrections employees who have daily contact with inmates. Apparently, there are around three hundred teachers employed by DOC who are members of the Teachers' Retirement System and this amendment will allow them...elect to become SERS members. I would try to answer any questions, otherwise, move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1445.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Any discussion? If not, Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1445. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

HB 1474
2nd reading

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1453, Senator Luft. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1453, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1453.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1467, Senator D'Arco. House Bill 1474, Senator Newhouse. 1500, Senator DeAngelis. All right. Senator Newhouse, do you wish to have your bill called? 1474, bottom of page 59? House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1474, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1474.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The...the Committee on Public Health, Welfare and Corrections offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Oh, I'm sorry, committee amendment. Senator Newhouse. Go get Senator Newhouse the file. Mr...Senator Newhouse, it's a very short amendment. Mr. Secretary, would you please read the...amendment.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

(Secretary reads committee amendment)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse moves the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1474. Any discussion? Senator...Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Mr. President and Senators, this is the Department of Public Aid amendment and it addresses the concerns of small townships, I think I ought to share that with you. That's what the amendment does. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Any discussion? Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Newhouse, we have sent that amendment to try to get an assessment back. I think let's go ahead and put it on, and if we do have a major problem with it, we'll get...get back. But I... I think it does take care of our concerns. So let's put it on and then...if I can have your commitment to bring it back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Newhouse moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1474. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 1500. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1500.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

HB 1547
2nd Reading

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Philip and Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What this would require would be that when a new county official was elected, the county board would order an audit of the old county official. So that when the new official was sworn in, he'd have an idea how much furniture he had, how much cash, et cetera, et cetera. Be happy to answer any questions. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to 1500.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Any discussion? If not, Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1500. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1517, Senator Holmberg. Senator Holmberg, 1517. All right. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1517, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1517.

(Secretary begins reading title of bill.)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Oh, wait a minute...wait a minute...wait a minute. Take it out of the record. Page 60. 1529, Senator Collins. 1540, Senator Savickas. 1547, Senator Degnan. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1547, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1547.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from...

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Committee on...Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1547 and Amendment No. 1 from the committee creates the Recordation and Transfer Tax Act which deals with land trusts in which beneficial interest is transferred and says that those shall be recorded in the same manner as a land deed and applies a tax to those transactions. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Degnan moves the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1547. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment...Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Degnan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Floor amendment...to House Bill 1547 changes the title of the Act to record...Recordation and Transfer Tax Act. I move

HB 1552
2nd Reading

its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator...Degnan has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1547. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1552, Senator Vadalabene. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1552, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1552.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1552 raises the minimum salaries of circuit clerks, county treasurers, county clerks, recorders, auditors and coroners and exempts the bill from the provisions of the State Mandate's Act. And I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene moves the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1552. Any discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. As minority spokesman of the Local Government Committee, several of us opposed this concept in committee and I think maybe we ought to go into a little more detail on what we're really talking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Can we have some order, please. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

This...this certainly is a pay increase for local officials. And, of course, we're talking about circuit clerks, county clerks, county treasurers, county recorders, county auditors and also coroners. It's not just a modest increase, what we are actually doing is increasing the minimum. I should explain that because some of the current officeholders will be over this minimum but we are increasing the minimum and we are exempting this from the State Mandate's Act, so this is something that is going to fall back on the counties and I think it's going to be in the neighborhood of a two...a little...round two million dollar fiscal impact to county government. But anyway,...let...let's just take for example the clerks...everyone but the coroners. In a population of less than fourteen thousand, the current minimum is thirteen thousand five hundred, and they're talking about increasing that minimum...the proposal is here in this particular amendment is to increase it to twenty-two thousand. That's a sixty-three percent increase. If you're in a county of a population between fourteen and thirty thousand, the increase is to twenty-six thousand. Now remember, this is minimums, and that's a seventy-nine percent increase over the current structure. If you're in thirty to sixty thousand, we're talking about a hundred and six percent increase to thirty-one thousand. If you're in a population county of sixty to a hundred thousand, we're talking about thirty-four thousand dollar minimum and that's a hundred and twenty-six

percent increase over the current Statute. If you're in a county of a hundred thousand to two hundred thousand, we're going to increase your...county officials' salaries minimum to thirty-seven thousand dollars and that's a hundred and twenty-four percent increase. Two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand population, forty-one thousand, that is a hundred and twenty-eight percent increase. From...in a population county from three hundred thousand to six hundred thousand, we're talking about forty-four thousand minimum and that's a hundred and twenty percent increase. And if you're in a county from six hundred thousand to two million, we're going to have a minimum salary of fifty thousand dollars and that's a hundred and fifty percent increase over the current twenty thousand dollar minimum. Now, the coroners, I'm not going to go through all that on the coroners but they're equally as...as bad. In fact, in counties of less than five thousand, we're going to have coroners working for eight thousand dollar minimum. Now in some counties of this State that's going to be over a thousand dollars in inquest. We're going to...paying county coroners over a thousand dollars an inquest in some counties of this State by this particular proposal. I'm not for...probably the county officials deserve an increase, but I think a modest increase is probably more adequate than what we're talking about at this particular amendment. I would urge a No vote and we've got other amendments to follow if this, in fact, does go on, but I certainly would urge a No vote on this particular amendment.

END OF REEL

REEL #4

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator, this is a committee amendment.

SENATOR WATSON:

I understand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise also in opposition to this amendment for two reasons, and most of the reasons that I oppose it has already been stated by Senator Watson, but it seems...just a few days ago I was asked to handle an amendment to increase from five to ten percent four counties to be able to levy additional dollars to maintain and to be able to match State and Federal monies for their highway systems, after only a year ago when we actually took monies away from local government. Now, here we are again...and I didn't support that bill when we took the money away but I'm asked to support the bill to increase taxes locally so they can maintain their roads. Now, here we are again, bypassing a Mandate's Act, going to raise upon the county government a mandate that they pay higher salaries when we raise this minimum, no means to pay for and then they'll be back in a year or two and asking some of us that tried to point out the problem now to...to give them more money so they can maintain theirselves, and several of the county board members in my area have said, maybe they ought to eliminate the county board if we're going to mandate everything here from Springfield. We don't like to be mandated from Washington and I think we ought to...to kill this amendment and...and get on with out business.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I'm a little chagrined that no one has really gotten this thing into perspective. I'm going to temper my remarks. This is the first time in eight years that these minimums have been raised and those percentages that were given by my friend from Southern Illinois have really nothing to do with reality. Most of the counties are paying far above the present minimum. As I said, it hasn't been raised in eight years. We are in the process of preparing for you a county-by-county, district-by-district breakdown and you're going to find in a lot of the counties that the salaries that the minimums we're talking are five hundred or a thousand, two thousand dollars over or actually under what the current salary is, the proposed minimums and, in fact, that the minimum has almost no affect on most of the major counties of the State, minimal affect on a large percentage to the ones that are rest...that are left. There are, and I would be the first to admit, some counties that this does have some impact on. We're talking about relatively modest salaries at the lower county level. We're talking about, I think, eighty-five hundred dollars a year for a coroner who is on call three hundred and sixty-five days a year, who has the honor of picking up a body, and we have one coroner who has had several years taken off his life span from hepatitis. I wonder how many of us here want to pick up AIDS victims' bodies for eighty-five hundred dollars a year? Well, I'll tell you that is just...most of these counties are paying far above what the minimum is. We can get you the detailed information...the other thing which hasn't been pointed out is that most of these county officials have four-year terms, and I don't have to tell any member of the Senate that their salaries can't be raised in the middle of a term, half of

them this wouldn't impact on for three years, that's eleven years without any kind of raise in the minimum and the others will be impacted on in a year and a half and then they go four years, that's twelve years without an increase. You start talking about some of these percentages, we're talking two or three percent a year. Now, we only set minimums, we don't set maximums and the reason we set minimums is that occasionally there'll be a partisan split between the county board and the officials or a personality conflict and we'll see some county boards do some things to county officials they don't happen to agree with philosophically or personally and lower the salaries down as low as they can get away with just as a vindictive measure against someone because of their partisan beliefs. I don't like being in the salary business. I do think we have an obligation to continue to set minimums and to raise them on occasion. I don't think these proposals are...are out of line; in the vast majority of the counties, the impact is fairly minimal and some counties there is an impact and I suspect those of you that have those counties already know about it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The previous speaker said something I found interesting. He said, we don't set maximums, we set minimums. Well, that I don't think is true in this case, because if you look at the minimums that are to be paid in your counties, particularly in downstate, I think you'll agree with me that, in fact, we are setting maximums. We're setting the salary. Now, it has been the practice of...and...and I say we're setting the salary because the...the minimums are so high that I don't think our counties are going to pay over the minimum that we mandate. It has been the procedure of the Illinois General Assembly to

set minimums, and I suggest to you that while I may not agree with that idea, I'm not going to fight the idea, but what I'm fighting is what I think is happening here now and that is that we are setting the maximum...or the minimum so high that counties are by and large going to pay those minimums so that from now on when the county official wants a pay raise, they aren't going to go to the county board, where they really ought to go, they're going to come to us, and I submit to you that that's something we should not be getting into. I would urge a No vote on this amendment and a Yes vote on the next amendment which seeks to raise the minimums by about twenty percent across the board which I think is a more reasonable approach. I urge a No vote on this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President, and to some people's surprise, I rise in support of the amendment for several reasons. One, I want to reiterate one thing Jack Schaffer said. For a lot of these people, at a minimum you're talking eight...and in some cases eleven years in between raising that minimum. They have a four-year term. You really can't change it a whole lot in the middle unless you put in some form of step, which I personally happen to support and would like to do it that way but that doesn't seem to be the prevailing attitude at the moment. The point is, you're not talking about a one-year raise, you're talking a raise that deals with four years or in some cases eight years or at worst...in a worse case in there some of them eleven years. You have to be realistic. You know, these guys, men and women are just like us, they got kids in college too. How would you like to be going four, eight and eleven years without a raise? I think you do have to at least bring up the minimum and, as Jack said, you know, you got to remember, it doesn't hit that many. What it

does is at least take care of a...of a limited number at the...at the bottom end. So, I ask...it's Sam's bill, it's Sam's amendment, if you're against the amendment, vote against the bill on 3rd reading, but let him get his bill in the shape that Sam would like to be...have the bill in and then we can argue some of this on 3rd reading; but I say, keep in perspective, this is not a one-year raise you're talking about, and I don't see why Sam can't have the bill in the shape that he'd like to have it in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well, for what it's worth, just to call the attention of the Body, a number of these bills were introduced into the Executive Committee and we put them all into a subcommittee for the simple reason that we looked at the proposed increases and thought they were way out of proportion. We did not put those bills into a subcommittee to kill them and, as I understand it, none of these officers can take these pay raises until their next election anyway. We were thoroughly going to...to study the...the pay raises and come back with something that's reasonable. I, too, believe there ought to be a pay raise; but, you know, as I'm looking at this sheet here, we have people that are getting a hundred and twenty-four percent, a hundred and twenty-six percent, a hundred and twenty-eight percent increase in those minimums. You know, I think we got to be a little bit reasonable here. Let's come up with a pay raise. My understanding is there will be an amendment offered that will increase it somewhere around twenty percent. I don't know if that's right or wrong but, boy, that's a lot closer than what we're doing here. I suggest we defeat this amendment and possibly put on the next amendment. If enough...anything else, let's leave it in the Executive Committee and let's study it and come up with some

decent recommendations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I did not support this amendment in committee. In fact, when I was...elected to a member of the General Assembly, I didn't realize this...this is the type of thing we would be dealing with. I find it hard to believe that the...the local unit of government, and in this case the county, should not be the one that sets the wages and if, in fact, the clerks and whoever else may be covered in this legislation feel that they're...unduly being...they are not getting the wage they should, they should be taking that to the...to their...to their constituents and not to Springfield. I think it's about as ludicrous as us determining that members of village boards are not getting paid enough. Some of them...many of the work for nothing, many of them work long hours for absolutely no compensation whatsoever, and it's just about as ludicrous as...as us putting a minimum wage on village...villages and towns in...in the State of Illinois. I would urge a No vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator...Vadalabene may close.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I'd just like to repeat the echos of Senator Schaffer and...and Senator Keats, and some of the misinterpretations that were given by the opponents. This bill will not automatically raise all the salaries of elected county officials, because many of the counties are already at or above the salary levels comprised in this bill; and according to the various county official organizations, many of the elected county officials have had...have had

not...have not had an increase in several years and in some cases as much as twelve years, and so the percentage that was given by Senator Watson is a little bit misleading. This legislation will not apply until after the next county elections, and I move for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1552.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of the Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1552. Those in favor of the amendment will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 29 Ayes, 21 Nays, none voting Present. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Watson, Schuneman, Mahar, Friedland and Sangmeister.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. That last roll call is probably an indication of what's to follow here in this particular amendment, but anyway, I do think this is a...a more responsible approach and a reasonable approach to the problem of salaries at the local level of the county officials. It's been alluded to that this particular amendment calls for a twenty percent increase and that...that's exactly what it does. We've discussed the issue at great length here in regard to the increases that were in the...the Committee Amendment No. 1, and I'm one who believes that possibly these

local officials do deserve a...a salary increase...a minimum increase and I...I've tried to reiterate that and I tried to mention that many times during my discussion that we are raising the minimums. We're not establishing salaries but we are raising the minimums. Now the county boards...and it has been alluded to by several of the previous speakers that some of these people won't get pay raises for eight, ten, twelve years. Now, that's simply not true. County boards can raise those salaries at anytime that they so wish and that, of course, would take effect after the...the following election, so what we do here isn't going to dictate policy necessarily at the...at the local level. They can raise those salaries if they so wish. But this amendment simply is a more reasonable approach, twenty percent increase across the board for all the...the county officials, and I'd be glad to answer any questions or...I'd certainly appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1552. Discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, again, Senator Watson did not tell you all the facts of that amendment. If I recall the amendment, it deletes everything from the enacting clause and it starts all over again, and you didn't tell that to...to the members on both sides of the aisle. Also, when we passed the sales tax collection giving the counties...instead of giving two percent...the State taking two percent, we reduced it to a cent and a half so we are providing funds to the counties for the...added expense of this pay. You supported me in adopting Amendment No. 1 and now I hope you will support me in killing Senator Watson's Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. There were some things said in debate before that...and I think Senator Watson alluded to this partially, but the suggestion was made that because the minimum has not been raised for some ten years or twelve years that these officials have not had pay raises. Now that's simply not true. The county officials have had pay raises; at least, I know those in my district have had regular pay raises. The problem with the bill...with the amendment that was adopted in the...in the committee is that we're setting the minimums so high that I think in most counties the minimum set by this Legislature will now be the pay scale and we shouldn't get into that. Unless you want to set the pay scale for every official in this State who serves some unit of local government, for goodness sakes,...let's not get into the business of setting everybody's pay scale in the world. We have enough problem with setting the ones that the Constitution requires us to set. If we want to set minimums, then I think Senator Watson has issued...or has offered a reasonable approach. Probably the best approach was the one suggested by Senator Sangmeister and that's to refer the whole thing to a Senate committee for further studies so we can come out with a reasonable bill, but I think this amendment ought to be adopted.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I...Senator Vadalabene tells me this amendment strikes the enacting clause. We haven't tried that game around here in quite a while. One thing that was...well, that's what he tells me, I don't know whether it's true or not, I haven't seen it. Okay. The important thing, I think, should be pointed out, and Sam has already pointed out, is that the...this amendment in...in practical effect guts the

bill and...and whether it strikes the enacting clause or not, it has that impact. The only reason I really wanted to mention was Senator Watson mentioned and...and I think he knows and didn't mean to imply this, but county officials are just like we are, they cannot have their salaries increased during the length of their term. So those people that are in mid-term right now are...are two or three years away from qualifying for whatever we do and those that are up for election next year, whatever we do or don't do will be good for the next four years after they're elected. I think what Senator Sam is talking about is that because of that length of term, we've had...we have a number of county officials whose salaries have been ridiculously low for a number of years; in fact, we have situations where the elected officials are among the lowest paid employees in the office, where their help actually makes considerably more than they do. My gosh, where else in the world do you see that? Except maybe here. I think we have to have...we have to relate to our fellow elected officials and...and, Senator Schuneman, we were setting county official salaries long before you and I came on the scene, and as much as I'd like to get out of setting salaries for anybody, particularly ourselves, my guess is that that onus duty will be on us long after Schuneman and Schaffer are long forgotten.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise in favor of this amendment and think...also it's a reasonable approach if...and I think the county officials deserve salary increases and that's exactly what this amendment attempts to do, at least...at least raise by twenty percent that minimum. For some of you who have served on the county board and I'm sure when you served on the county board

you didn't like a...a lot of mandates on you, and some of the county officials that have called in support of this amendment to me have...have been the same ones that have griped when we bypassed the Mandate's Act. Now, it's okay in this occasion since it's a pay raise for them. I think if...if we're going to bypass the Mandate's Act, maybe we ought to just go back and redo what we did before, and I hope for you that...support this bill and to bypass the Mandate's Act will go back and tell your constituency that...that...we were fakes when we passed the Mandate's...Act in the first place. This is a reasonable approach. I think we ought to support this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes...yes, sir. Thank you. I...I'm a little bit confused here. I have in front of me Committee Amendment No. 1 and it says here, "Amendment No. 1 amends House Bill 1552 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu of and thereof the following, and by deleting everything after the enacting clause." Was that mentioned on the House amendment...or Committee Amendment No. 1? No. Nobody said anything about that. Absolutely not. We're doing the same thing with No. 2. Okay? Number 2 is deleting everything after the enacting clause and we're just putting in there a reasonable approach and a responsible approach to salaries at the local level. I think this amendment should be adopted.

PRESIDENT:

Question is, the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1552. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 25

Ayes, 26 Nays, none voting Present. Amendment No. 2 fails. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary? I beg your pardon. Senator Watson has requested a verification. Will the members be in their seats. Do you have a particular roll call, Senator Watson, you wish verified? Which one?

SENATOR WATSON:

The Noes.

PRESIDENT:

...okay. I just...I just asked. It's your request, not mine. All right, Senator Watson has requested a verification. Will the members be in their seats. Mr. Secretary, please read the negative roll call.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The following voted in the negative: Carroll, D'Arco, Davidson, DeAngelis, Degnan, Demuzio, Dudycz, Etheredge, Fawell, Hall, Jeremiah Joyce, Keats, Kelly, Lechowicz, Lenke, Macdonald, Nedza, Newhouse, Philip, Poshard, Schaffer, Topinka, Vadalabene, Weaver, Zito, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any...

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, sir. D'Arco...Senator D'Arco.

PRESIDENT:

Is Senator D'Arco on the Floor? Senator D'Arco on the Floor? Strike his name, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR WATSON:

Lechowicz...Senator Lechowicz.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz on the Floor? Senator Lechowicz on the Floor? Strike his name, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Zito.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Zito on the Floor? Senator Zito is in the tele-

phone booth, Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Joyce. J.E. Joyce.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce. Senator Joyce on the Floor? Strike his name, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR WATSON:

Jones. Senator Jones is not on the...

PRESIDENT:

Not on the roll call, sir.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Barkhausen. I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT:

Senator, he's one of yours.

SENATOR WATSON:

Don't verify it.

PRESIDENT:

Be happy to strike him off.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I never thought I'd ever do this in my nineteen years and it's the first time and I need a little time. Will you verify the affirmative?

PRESIDENT:

All right, that request is in order. Senator Vadalabene has requested a verification...

SENATOR VADALABENE:

...and Lechowicz is back.

PRESIDENT:

Again, will the members be in their seats and the Secretary read the affirmative roll call.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The following voted in the affirmative: Barkhausen, Bloom, Coffey, Darrow, Donahue, Dunn, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Holmberg, Hudson, Jerome Joyce, Karpel, Kustra, Luft, Mahar, Maitland, Marovitz, O'Daniel, Rigney, Rupp, Sangmeister, Schuneman, Sommer, Watson, Welch.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Mr. Secretary, Senator Lechowicz is back in the hall. Please put him back on the roll call. Senator Vadalabene, do you question the presence of any member?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Marovitz on the Floor? Senator Marovitz on the Floor? Strike his name, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Barkhausen has just returned. He is in the back of the Chamber.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Senator Rupp.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rupp is in his seat.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis is in the Chamber.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

He's on our side? Senator Davidson.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson is not on the affirmative roll call.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

This is the first time I've ever done this, so you'll

have to...Senator Bloom.

PRESIDENT:

In his seat. All right, the roll has been verified, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The Yeas are 24 and the Nays are 24.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the Ayes are 24 and the Nays are 24. Amendment No. 2 fails. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 simply says we're going to comply with the State Mandate's Act. Amendment No. 1, the final provision, Section 8.9, exempts the legislation from the State Mandate's Act. All this...all my amendment does is says...well, if we're going to mandate it, let's pay for it, and I think that's something that's...that units of local government at all levels, whether it's county...county government or whatever, has been telling us for years is that, hey, the time has come that if you're going to dictate policy to us at the local level, then why not pass that money along with it? And I see no problem with that and I think that's, again, a reasonable and responsible approach. We're simply going to mandate these salary increases or salary minimum increases, then we should have to pay for it and I see no problem with that, and I imagine this amendment will go on with little or no opposition.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3. Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, and I think...that we should adopt this amendment. We've done this same thing on a lot of bills around here this year. The fact of the matter...the...the process has come to be known as the Schaffer process and the Schaffer amendment and...and in effect what we're doing here is to say that if the State is going to mandate cost on units of local government, the State ought to pay those costs, and I support Jack Schaffer in that effort and I would support this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion on the adoption of Amendment No. 3? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, first let me yield to Senator Schaffer in regard to Amendment No. 3, then I'll close.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I think it's a great idea. I mean, what the hay. It's about a million eight to...two million two annualized. I think it could...could be...make the bill almost invincible. We ought to put it on.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

I couldn't have said it any better than...

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1552. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 4 offered by Senator Welch.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch on Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment merely states that the clerks and the other officials other than the coroners shall devote their full time to duties of their offices, and I would move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Welch has moved adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1552. Any discussion? If not, all in favor...I beg your pardon, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I know some county officials...well, I think of one, for example, that has a real estate salesman's license and does occasionally do work of that kind. Is...would this preclude them...that person from practicing any job...well...and I think of another one who...who owns and operates a...a Laundromat, does it...doing that work at night and on weekends, would this preclude those people from doing that?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

If...if...it's a full-time job is the way the amendment reads. If a person owns real estate and rents it out, similarly if he has a business such as a...a self-operating coin laundry that...that is not a job, per se, then he could do that, yes. We just have increased the amount of pay to these officials in...in my county to thirty-seven thousand dollars a year and I think for...not a great deal of...of educational requirement and background that that's quite sufficient and should be a full-time job.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I don't know that I disagree really with what

you're trying to do except that...and...and I appreciate the fact that you and I are on the same side on these other amendments, but I think of people, for example, farmers who may hold some of these offices and...and...and work their farm at night and on weekends, and...and I haven't seen your amendment and I don't know exactly how you describe "job" but I have a concern about it.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion on Amendment No. 4? Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

...I guess my question would deal on the preclusion of attorneys that have income from their law firms although they're not practicing and they're a member of a firm or have an interest, this would not preclude them from obtaining fees; and, again, the attorneys have it both ways, they can hold the office, get the full salary and still receive fees or receive interest from their law firms and an ordinary citizen who tries to earn some extra money would be...unable under this.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, as long as the person is not practicing law, then he can receive the full salary. If you're talking about a person who was a lawyer, is elected in November to be a county clerk and in December 1st takes the job but he still has fees coming in, yes, he is entitled to continue receiving those fees for prior worked performed. This is just a collection process in which he's getting paid in the future, and in many cases, such as estate work, you don't get paid until the estate is settled, so that's the only delineation between the attorneys and...and otherwise. No, you can't practice law separately.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, but, Senator, if a lawyer gets elected and he still belongs to a law firm and in that office he generates through his contacts and they keep his name there, and I'm sure people would come to that firm because of his influence, he would still be generating an interest and monies from that firm. An ordinary citizen doesn't have this advantage. I think if you want to preclude everybody from out...you should say...no outside income, and I think that would be fair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah...Mr. President, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Does that apply to all offices?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

The amendment applies to the offices listed in this bill with the exception of the coroner...it does not apply to the coroner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Could you possibly list the office that's going to receive the least pay under the new bill...under the amendment and what that pay would be for that office?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

...for that I...I wouldn't know. I wasn't sure which

amendment was going to go on the bill, and depending on which amendment went on, that would determine what I did with this particular amendment, Senator; and not being the sponsor of the bill, I can't answer that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I think that if you're going to turn around and state that a person can't earn anymore than a certain amount of money, you ought to know how much that money is because it may not be sufficient enough for that person to live on, and one of the things that can be done with this is that when there is a split, that the board may purposely set the salary at such...at the minimum level so that they get that person out of office and that's not very Democratic, it's not even Republican.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

...I thank you, Mr. President, and I...I appreciate what the sponsor is trying to do but there are some real technical problems and...and Senator Savickas raised one of them. There are different ways to bring an income and if you are part of a partnership, you can receive partnership income for years even though...you're no longer being productive; therefore, a guy who's been...with a successful firm of some kind or other could be bring in significant outside income and it's not technically listed as...as earned income, I mean, it's just additional income being brought in. He may have...you know, produced stuff over time. Just technically it doesn't work. Senator Schuneman...the problem of being a farmer. You know, a few of the counties in Illinois outside of mine do happen to have farmers who run for office and, you know, farmers have a lot of free time during certain parts

of the year but, boy, you know, other times they don't and you just...you know,...basically excluding that class of person. What the amendment says is, if you're a wealthy guy, it's easy to hold that office, but if you're just a working stiff like the rest of us, you're kind of held back. I appreciate what you're trying to do, but I just think, practically, the amendment does not work and I would appreciate a negative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, looking at the amendment, I'm not sure exactly what the amendment does. It says that, "The clerks of the circuit court shall devote full...their full time to the duties of their office." Would this preclude a circuit clerk from being in the Illinois National Guard, for instance, where they have weekends and two weeks a...a year? Is that your intent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No, my intent is the...the standard definition of a full-time job which is usually a forty hour a week type of operation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER;

Well, I...I...you're just talking about if they put forty hours a week in, you...you consider that full-time. I would suspect that almost without exception other than sickness and that sort of thing, that I don't know of any of the county officials even in the small counties that don't put forty hours in. Now, what about a situation...I know of one small county where one of the county officials is an auctioneer and

he...he can be found on week nights and weekends doing auctions, but he puts a full forty hour in...hours in. Is that acceptable under your definition of full time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, my definition of full time would be so that the person doesn't have another job such as the person who would run for another elective office and be elected to two offices at the same time or be working in a law firm with a law degree, performing actual services in another job as opposed to either being self-employed or self-employed as a farmer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I think...I think I understand what you're saying and I don't...in fact, I think I really understand what you're saying, but I, frankly, think that all the county officials are full time. They're like us. The electors...if they don't like what they're doing can pitch them out. I have always been, frankly, against double dipping and I would suggest that there are some interesting precedents here. This is, obviously, anti-double dipping, which I guess I agree with, and a full-time recommendation; and who knows, we might even spread it over to the Legislature, it might...catch on, but...simply put, frankly, in some of the smaller counties, I can imagine a county official would serve on a township board or something like that. If you're talking about forty hours, I think let people...if they don't like what the person is doing, let them pitch them out just like they can pitch any one of us out if they don't like the...amount of time on it. And I think, probably...I think I understand what you're trying to get at, but I don't think that it's appropriate for the whole State. In my counties it

would make very little difference because my people are all full time and...and pay salary is way above the minimums mentioned now, but in the smaller, downstate counties, I can imagine it would cause a lot of hardship and might make it impossible for some very good people to stay in office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...echo the concerns of Senator Schaffer on this. I...there is no definition in this amendment for full time and, you know, full time...if, in fact, the...the sponsor is indicating that you spend as much time in the job to do the job adequately or...or do the job well, in some cases it may be thirty hours a week, some cases it may be sixty hours a week. I'm also concerned about whether or not...as Senator Schuneman indicated, somebody who may have a Laundromat whether they have to divest their interest in that Laundromat or can they do that after the working day or other than...over forty hours a week, and I'm...also concerned about avocations, whether or not that...you have to limit yourself as to whatever avocations you may have an interest in in order to determine whether you're doing the job on a full-time basis. I think that the...that if, in fact, we're going to do this, certainly...a more specific definitive definition of full time needs to be applied.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz. Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to clarify something...that farming is not a profit making business.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

...yes, I want to stand up and strongly oppose this amendment for one of the reasons that we're going to be setting a precedent here. Now, I happen to be a full-time Senator and I don't have any other interest, but let me caution you people here on the Floor of the Senate, you lawyers, you insurance people, you real estate people and whatever profession you're in, this is the start of something big, and it wouldn't surprise me if Senator Welch would move in that direction in the not too distant future. So, not only are the county officials affected by this, but a lot of you people also will be affected in the near future; and I'm sure that if your ox is being gored, you're going to be voting the other way at that particular time. This is a bad amendment and it should be defeated also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Welch, you may close.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's very interesting the turn these arguments have taken. Now, all of a sudden, Senator Keats is telling us we have to protect the poor lawyer who also runs for county office. Yesterday, he was bashing lawyers; today, he's their protector. I think it's kind of interesting that Senator Keats uses lawyers to whichever side he happens to be on in that particular day, but the bill is full-time jobs, meaning a salaried position. There's no question of divesting oneself of a Laundromat. Keep your Laundromat. Keep your farm. Keep your private job. What we're getting at is double-dipping people, people who run for two jobs, people who are paid some thirty-seven, forty-four thousand, even fifty thousand dollars a year, and you're saying they shouldn't be a full-time employee for the people

they are elected by? I say, boloney. I say they should devote their entire time to serving the people that they are elected to serve, and to say, Senator, that my next move is going to make this job full time when I'm only paid twenty-eight thousand dollars a year is not telling what the future is going to hold. I am not going to do that. So, let me just urge you to vote Yes. This is a bill which will help prevent double dipping. It's a bill which is going to give your constituents their dollar's worth from their county officials, and when this huge, huge pay raise becomes law, you can say, I did my best to get you your fair dollar's worth for a dollar's work, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1552. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it. Amendment No. 4 fails. Further amendments? All right, Senator...further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1556, Senator Keats. 1578, Senator Holaberg. All right, House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1578, Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Senator Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

...point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Could someone please check and see what Senator Watson and Senator Welch had for lunch today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there may be a lot that simply don't care what they

had for lunch. All right, Senate Bill 1578,...Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1578.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Holmberg.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 is a...a Department of Public Aid amendment and it states that such sums shall be in addition to and separate from amounts ordered to be paid as maintenance or child support, and I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Holmberg has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1578. Any discussion? Senator...Senator Chew, do you wish discussion on this bill? Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1598, Senator Kustra. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1598, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government

offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Mr. President, I have a Floor amendment which would take the place of the committee amendments. So, I would move to Table the committee amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Kustra moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1598. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Kustra.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a technical amendment. It does make the effective date immediate; other than that, it cleans up some spelling errors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kustra moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1598. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1688, Senator Netsch. 1768, Senator Luft.

HB 1769
2nd Reading

House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1768. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

...House Bill 1768.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1769, Senator Philip. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1769, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1769.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I move that we Table Committee...Amendment No. 1, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip has moved to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Philip and J. E. Joyce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 2 strips everything after the enacting clause. If you'll remember, the bill originally provided that to move any type of building material with a helicopter you had to have twin engines. This strikes that out completely, it allows you twin engines or single engines, the way the Statute is, also creates the DuPage County Airport Authority. As you're probably aware, we now have the Fox Valley Airport Authority which extends into DuPage and Kane County. Unfortunately, Kane County now controls that authority. The DuPage County Airport is with...wholly in DuPage County. That's simply what it does. I move the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1769. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. That was close. 1800, Senator Berman. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1800, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1800.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Revenue offers one

amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. This...this is the Committee Amendment No. 1 amended the bill so that the...the tax increment funding proposal and the abatement refund of the sales tax would both be incorporated into the amended bill. Move the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1800. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. Pursuant to the discussion in committee, this amendment is being offered and what it does is limits the TIF sales tax refund to one, maybe two TIF districts in the State of Illinois. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1800. Any discussion? Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate...this amendment does...does plow new ground and it

MS 1806
2nd reading

would require that the...would require the State to set aside one-cent of it...State sales tax in order to guarantee that the bonds sold by the TIF would eventually be retired. So, I think this is something that we'll want to talk about on 3rd reading; however, I do think the sponsor is...entitled to get this bill in the form in which he wants it at this time. We can talk about it later.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Berman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Any further discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1806, Senator Kelly. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1806, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1806.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

I'm sorry, there is a committee amendment, Amendment No. 1...Committee on Elections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Committee Amendment No. 1, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This is a technical amendment. It...merely repeals the section that's already repealed. That's all the amendment does and I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly moves the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1806. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1813. House Bill 1813, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1813.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Macdonald.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment establishes guidelines and reasonable time frames for the State Board of Elections to conduct its test of automatic tabulating equipment in certain selected jurisdictions. This is an agreed amendment between the Illinois County Clerk's Association, the Association of Boards of Election Commissioners and the State Board of Elections. Be happy to answer any questions. I ask for the support of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any discussion? Senator Macdonald has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1813. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1814, Senator Bloom. All right, House...1857, Senator Philip. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 1857, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1857.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that we adopt...Committee Amendment No. 1...No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip has moved...

SENATOR PHILIP:

No. 2....am I right for a change? Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Let's put No. 2 up on the board. All right, it is No. 1. All right, Senator Philip, it is, in fact, No. 1. Senator Philip has moved to adopt Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1857. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment...Floor Amendment No 2 is at the request of the Illinois Board of Realtors. It solved one of their problems. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1857. Any discussion? If not, those in favor...Senator Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield to a question? What does Amendment No. 2 do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yes, this provides that real estate is...if we would put on by a front-door referendum a quarter-cent sales tax, it would not pertain to real estate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Answers my question. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1857. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well,...evidently, we have...made a mistake. I have the correct amendment. Amendment No. 2, I would move that we Table because it is incorrect...or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was adopted...those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is reconsidered. Senator Philip now moves to Table Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1857. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is Tabled. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

This is the corrected version. I understand it is...is mechanically correct. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1857. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee...Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1889, Senator Degnan. 1914, Senator Mahar. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1914, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1914.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I offered that amendment in committee and there is some problems with it. I would move to Table that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Mahar, would you repeat that again, please?

SENATOR MAHAR:

Yes, I had offered that...I offered that Amendment No. 1 in committee and I move to Table the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Mahar moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment...Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

HB 1952
2nd Reading

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1915, Senator Coffey. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 1915, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1915.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1919, Senator Donahue. House Bill 1919, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1919.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 1933, Senator Donahue. 1934, Senator Macdonald. 1952, Senator DeAngelis. House bills 2nd reading...we got a live one, House Bill 1952, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1952.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I would like to move to Table that amendment. We inadvertently deleted some exclusions. I have an amendment that corrects that following that from the Floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1952. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Mr. Secretary, what's the number of that amendment, 'cause we had filed a wrong amendment previously...

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The amendment number is LRB8401420JMCSAM07.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Okay. Yes...all right, Amendment No. 2 puts back in the exceptions that were inadvertently deleted and also allows CMS to get into some cost containment procedures to give more benefits for less money. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator DeAngelis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1952. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes

HB 1963
2nd Reading

have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 1963, Senator Barkhausen. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1963. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1963.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. While we're on that page, 1889. On the Order...with leave of the Body, on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1889. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1889.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Degnan on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. At the request of Cook County we are taking out two parcels, parcels nine and twenty-two with Committee Amendment No. 1. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Degnan has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1899. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed.

HB 2096
2nd Reading

The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. We're at the top of page 62. If I can have your attention, the Committee on Appropriations I will meet at four o'clock in Room 212, and so we will be concluding our business wherever it stops us and we'll pick it up tomorrow. We'll conclude in a couple of minutes. 2062, Senator Etheredge. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2062. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 2062.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 2096, Senator Schaffer. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2096. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 2096.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 2097. On the Order of House Bills 2nd

Reading is House Bill 2097. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 2097.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 2115, Senator Maitland. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2115. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 2115.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Maitland on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. First of all, pursuant to an agreement in the Elementary and Secondary Committee, I would move to Table Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Maitland has moved to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2115. Any discussion? If not, all in favor of the motion to Table indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Maitland.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Maitland on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. Committee Amendment No. 2 provides that there are financial records...a financial audit for the regional...the regional offices of a...of a...of superintendent of schools. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2115. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. It's five minutes to four. I think in fairness to the Appropriations Committee, we will now conclude our business. Senator Topinka, we will start tomorrow at noon with 2179 and carry on through. Any further business? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to announce that at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning in Room 212, Appropriation II will start promptly at nine, please...there so we can get out.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just...just to remind the members, I know you did it already, as far as Appropriation I, we'll reconvene immediately after adjournment in Room 212.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a reminder that there is the Senate-House baseball game at Iles Park at six o'clock tonight. I'd appreciate everyone being there as promptly as possible and let's make this a big evening for the Senate. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

All right, further announcements? Further business? If not, Senator Vadalabene moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Thursday, June 20, tomorrow, at the hour of noon. Noon tomorrow. The Senate stands adjourned.