

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

JUNE 21, 1985

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Members will be at their desks. Prayer today...our guests in the galleries will please rise. Our prayer today will be by the Rabbi Israil Zoberman of the Temple B'rith Sholom, Springfield, Illinois.

RABBI ZOBERMAN:

(Prayer given by Rabbi Zoberman)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, June 12th and Thursday, June 13th and Friday, June 14th and Tuesday, June 18th and Wednesday, June 19th and Thursday, June 20th, in the year 1985, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion placed by Senator Vadalabene. Are there any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Hall, chairman of Appropriations II Committee, reports out the following House bills:

24 and 1040 with the recommendation Do Pass.

652, 664, 672, 674, 678, 679, 993 and 1070 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Carroll, chairman of Appropriations I Committee, reports out the following House bills:

342, 362, 418, 529, 655, 693, 946, 1110, 2239 and 2240 with the recommendation Do Pass.

143, 526, 530, 569, 583, 641, 651, 653, 654, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 663, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 673, 676, 677, 693, 721, 947, 1011, 1037 and 1247 with

the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate, the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate, in the passage of the following Senate bills together with House amendments:

- Senate Bill 14, House Amendment 1.
- Senate Bill 39, House Amendment 2.
- Senate Bill 98, House Amendment 1.
- 147, House Amendment 1.
- 158, House Amendment 1.
- 172, House Amendment 1.
- 211, House Amendments 1 and 2.
- 254, House Amendment 1.
- 312, House Amendment 1.
- 319, House Amendment 1.
- 320, House Amendments 1 and 2.
- 397, House Amendment 1.
- 405, House Amendment 1.
- 416, House Amendments 2 and 3.
- 448, House Amendment 1.
- 497, House Amendments 1 and 2.
- 561, House Amendments 1 and 2.
- 612, House Amendment 1.
- 616, House Amendment 1.
- 840, House Amendment 1.
- 925, House Amendment 1.
- 982, House Amendment 2.
- 997, House Amendment 1.
- 1029, House Amendments 1 and 2.
- 1103, House Amendment 1.

1121, House Amendment 1.
1129, House Amendment 2.
1142, House Amendment 1.
1143, House Amendment 1.
1166, House Amendment 1.
1180, House Amendment 1.
1236, House Amendments 1 and 2.
1379 with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise? Can we have some order, please. Will you break up the caucus, Senator Rigney...the caucus behind you there. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think we have had, thus far at least, a very productive week. I have just spoken a little earlier with Senator Philip, it is our intent to conclude our businesses rapidly as possible, at the same time affording the members the opportunity to offer whatever amendments they wish. My suggestion is that we start with the recall list and on the Calendar there are only eighteen bills yet remaining on 2nd reading. So we will go through the recall list, through the eighteen bills on second reading and then we will adjourn until Monday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, we'll go to the Order of Resolutions...leave granted? Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate...excuse me, Senate Resolution 387 offered by Senator Lemke, congratulatory.

388, by Senator Lemke, congratulatory.

389, by Senator Lemke, congratulatory.

And 390, by Senator Kelly and it's congratulatory.

HB 52
Recalled

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. All right. We will go to the Order of Recalls. There has been a list which has been distributed. We will begin with House Bill 49. Senator Hall seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 49 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 49, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by...Senator Hall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall. Senator Hall, your microphone does not work, perhaps you could go over to Senator Holmberg's microphone. Senator Hall on Senator Holmberg's microphone.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 is to bring it in conformity with the exactly as...as the bill that went over from the Senate, Senate Bill 39. This amendment gives...makes some technical changes, it corrects some spelling errors and it has that where the jurisdiction was given municipalities the bill within ten miles, it was reduced to three miles. And I ask for adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Hall has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 49. Any discussion? If not, those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. House Bill 52. Senator Marovitz seeks

leave of the Body to return House Bill 52 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 52, 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 Senate. This is the agreed amendment offered by the department and the operators in...regarding day-care facilities, licensed child-care facilities and background checks, and when those background checks can be made, and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 52.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 52. Any discussion? Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Just for...point of clarification, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Senator Marovitz, do I understand from this that we are taking out the twenty dollar fee that DCFS could charge the applicant or employee to...defray some of these background checking costs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I...I believe that's true. This is the amendment that was...prepared by DCFS and...and given me by DCFS.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

AB 52

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

...I also had a question about the definition in the amendment of child-care facility and wondered whether it...it might be such that...employees other than those who are actually dealing directly with children and, therefore, might...justifiably be checked would also have to undergo the kind of examination that this calls for. In other words, just...do you know, does this only apply to those who are dealing directly with children or might it through this definition apply to others as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

...it is my understanding that...it would apply to others...employed by the facility where the children are...are located.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

It...it's been explained to me that DCFS intends by rule to exclude those who will not be dealing directly with children, and if that's the case, I guess I don't have any problem with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

I rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator, let's get the bill out first. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 52. 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...Holmberg, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

State your point.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Yes, for members of the Senate who may not be aware of the fact that this is Swedish Midsummer Day and in honor of that...the Swedish American delegation, the Senate and the House honored Governor Thompson at breakfast today for being named Swedish American of the Year by the Country of Sweden.

He will go there in August to receive his award. And when further...to help all of you celebrate with us, we have Swedish coffeecake from Senator Cal Schuneman and myself, the two Swedes in the Senate, and we hope you'll enjoy it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

It's right down here by the Republican side of the aisle. On the Order of our Recall sheet...Calendar we have House Bill 54. Senator Lemke wishes to recall House Bill 54 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 54. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LENKE:

What...amendment to House Bill 54 does is...incorporates Senate Bill...1002 which is a bill we passed out of here 59

to nothing, and the House chairman of Judiciary didn't see fit to post it on the call. What this bill does is requires all child-care facility directors, officers, employees and volunteers be certified by the Department of Law Enforcement.

This is in conjunction where a program is to I-SEARCH and...and child abuse. And I think it's a good bill and we in the Senate saw fit to pass it 59 to nothing, but the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee seems fit not to even post it or give it a proper hearing. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 54. 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. House Bill 72, Senator Poshard...seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 72 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills...2nd Reading, House Bill 72, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Rupp.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment makes a number of somewhat technical changes in the amendment which was added to the bill in the House, and it impacts on the responsibilities or the authority of the Director of Insurance. It has been agreed to by the Illinois Mine Subsidence Fund. I ask adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there...is there discussion? Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Well,...Mr. President, I'd like a copy of the amendment, I haven't seen the amendment or anything else and...I am carrying the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Your...you deserve it. Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Yes. Can we take it out of the...the record temporarily and hold it until we've read the amendment and then we'll come back to it. Is that all right, Mr. President? Is that all right, Senator Rupp? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Leave...leave is granted. Motion carries. I would suggest that the Chamber is beginning to look like the House with all the talk and action. If we can just quiet down a little and act like Senators. House Bill 231, Senator...Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 231 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this amendment does is...amends to House Bill 231, eight bills that we passed out of this Body in criminal law 59 to nothing that the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee didn't see fit to even post or call or let the witnesses testify. I think it's our...our duty to make sure that these insignificant criminal law bills get...get heard by the full House and adopted because I ask...I...I think

they're good bills. I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Mr. President, we haven't seen any of these amendments...you know, you're amending eight bills onto this, we haven't even seen them. Now he says they passed 59 to nothing, whatever, but...it'd be just a little bit of a courtesy to see that we get the amendment anyhow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we can proceed in an orderly manner and be out of here quickly if we get some order. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, Mr. President, I think it would speed up things if we had copies of these amendments, maybe they're all right, but just as a courtesy, we look at them and move...move on ahead.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. We would ask that...sponsors furnish the membership with their amendments, if they wish. Senator Lenke...what's your pleasure?

SENATOR LENKE:

Can we just take this briefly out of the record, come back to it and when they get their amendments, I'm sure they'll be...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Is there leave to come back to 231? Leave is granted. House Bill 243, Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 243 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 243, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

HB 314
Recalled

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Maitland.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 243 contains part of the legislation that I introduced into the Senate some months ago with regard to teacher certification. It has to do with the...with teachers who were not citizens of the United States. And we have substantially changed that...that legislation, and this is the way we've changed it. We say in regard to the citizenship requirement for teacher certification, it will be the State board's determination as to whether or not this certification can be extended and it's done if they determine there is a shortage of teachers in that particular area. It also would...would suggest that if extenuating circumstances were involved that they could give that some consideration also. I would be happy to respond to any questions and if not, I would move the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 243. 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. 314. Senator Karpel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 314 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 314, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Karpziel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpziel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Amendment No. 3...thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 314 allows alcoholic beverages to be served in nursing homes when a physician and the doctors say it's okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpziel has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 314. Any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 377. Senator Topinka seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 377 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 377, 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, Amendment No. 1 is offered by the Illinois Press Association, it takes care of their concern. What it basically does is provide a penalty by law that any jury commissioner convicted under this section would forfeit a performance bond and would be held liable for taking any gratuity in...in order to handle jury summonses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 377. 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 offered by Senators Newhouse and Hall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse. Senator Darrow. Can't see Senator Newhouse. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Let me apologize to Senator Topinka, this...Senator Topinka...this kind of caught me by surprise as well and I...I apologize for that. This is...this is the peremptory challenge amendment and...I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Newhouse has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 377. Is there any discussion? Senator Topinka,

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, if I might, I would like to ask Senator Newhouse what his amendment does, because it strikes me as sounding like something else because it involves the roofing industry and it involves things that seem to be more of a labor management type of an issue rather than challenges to a jury. Could he more thoroughly explain this amendment which I have not seen up to this point?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Could we have some order, please. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank...thank you, Mr. President, and...and I will explain, and let me explain to Senator Topinka, I saw it almost when you did, so let me now tell you what it does. What this...this is intended to...to cure the problem of use

of...of...of peremptory...challenges to keep minorities off juries in jury cases. That's the genesis of the bill and that's what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Question of the sponsor. How does it do that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, it gives the court the discretion where it believes that peremptory challenges have been used for this purpose, then the court makes that judgment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Can we have some order, please. We'll just slow the process down, ladies and gentlemen, until we get some order...the...the gentleman cannot hear. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Is...is this a reconstitution of the bill that was held in the Senate Executive Committee and placed in a subcommittee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, in that event, I stand opposed to Amendment No. 2. Difficulty is that we...we did, in fact, have that bill in committee. It was determined by the chairman and at least a majority of the committee members that that bill deserved some further study because it imposes, as I understood it, a duty on the clerk of the courts across this State to compile

*HB 431
As called*

statistics, and in particular in the County of Cook we don't provide any money for the clerk of the court to compile these statistics. And the fact of the matter is, the Supreme Court by rule has attempted to deal with the question of peremptory challenges, and it seems to me since that rule change was...was just recently, we ought to at least give the rule a chance to operate. There...there didn't seem to be much objection to the holding or deferral of this legislation until the fall, and I don't see the necessity of this kind of a stampede effort.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Take it out of the record, Mr...Mr. President, I did not mean to cause this kind of conflict on the Floor, and I'll take it out of the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...you wish...Senator Newhouse, do you wish to simply withdraw your amendment, it is Senator Topinka's bill. Senator Newhouse withdraws Amendment No. 2. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 431. Senator Maitland seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 431 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House bills 2nd reading, House Bill 431.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 would allow the DuPage County Board

to appoint the fair board, which it does not do. Be happy to answer any questions. Move the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Question of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROCK:

Who does it now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

The fair board which is appointed by...the executive director of the fair, believe it or not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there...Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, I agree. Anything we can do for Jack Knuepfer and the DuPage County Board, I'm in favor of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Philip moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 431. 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. House Bill 474, Senator Berman. Senator Berman seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 474 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 474, Mr.

Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Berman, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Yesterday we adopted Amendment No. 2 that spelled out the right to...assess for fees for the sheriff and coroner in...as costs. The wording was in...inappropriate and I've got Amendment 3 to correct it. At this point, I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was adopted for purposes of Tabling.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Having voted on the prevailing side, Senator Berman wishes to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was adopted. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Hearing no objection, the vote is reconsidered. Now, Senator Berman moves to Table Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 474. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the...Amendment No. 2 is Tabled. Any further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. This does the same thing, it spells out that sheriffs' and coroners' fees may be taxed as cost. Also spells out the right to assess costs for private process servers. Move the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Berman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 474. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

AB 497
Re called

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 497, Senator Donahue. Senator Donahue...seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 497 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is...is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 497, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Sangmeister.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yes, thank you. What Amendment No. 1 does is, it allows...in counties of population in one million, does not go into Cook County, allows private detectives who are properly licensed and properly schooled without special appointment by the court to serve process. This is outside of Cook County. This is a bill that did not get a hearing in one of our committees and we're asking that it get a hearing on 3rd reading. I move the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR DARROW:

Is the Sheriff's Association in support of this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

I have no idea. I would...my presumption would be they would not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator...Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

What control do we have...or what control does the court retain over the private process servers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

...he has to be properly registered and received instruction on proper procedures for serving process from the sheriff of the county in which the service is to be made. In other words, he's got to be trained by the sheriff in the county. The court...also in its direction upon motion orders service to be made through an entity which is engaged in the process of serving process by any of the employees of such business over eighteen years of age. So, he's got to be trained.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, very much. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Isn't...isn't this the bill that we heard that, in effect, we...we killed because of the fact that...that some of these process servers do...particularly in our area, Senator, we have process servers that may serve in Cook County, in Kane County, in Will County, in McHenry County, in DuPage County. You know, the objections that I heard to this bill was that you are requiring these process servers to be

trained in each one of these circuits, and...and you're going to have these guys doing nothing but go from one class to another because of the...the proximity of the...of...of the...of the counties. You know, there was a gentleman from your county and a gentleman from my county who were testifying against this bill because what they do for a living is serve process...serve papers, particularly for private attorneys because they can't...the private attorneys cannot get the sheriff to serve some of these papers. And what you're talking about is, if you've got a client in my county, he's going to have to come up and get trained in...not only in your county but in my county because that's where the papers are being served. And if he has to follow the guy into Cook County, he's going to have to be trained in Cook County and he's going to have to be registered in each one of these counties. I...you know...you...what you're doing, basically, is driving these guys out of business. And then all the attorneys are going to go crazy because they're not going to have anybody to serve their papers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there...Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well, I'm not quite sure I follow all of the problem on that, Senator Fawell. What the bill basically does is allows private detectives that have received instruction from the sheriff in the county in which the service is to be made, so they're not running helter-skelter all over, that sheriff has trained them and that is certified to the court, then he can serve. One of the problems is getting the sheriff's office to get off their duff and get out and serve process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

What I'm talking about, Senator, is what is happening is

you, you know, if all the services that that particular gentleman was going to be serving, if all the papers he was going to be serving was just in your county, then he would go to your sheriff. If all of them were going to be served in just my county, he would be served by...he would be trained by my sheriff. If that's the bill that...that we're talking about, what I am saying is, he'll not only have to be trained by the Will County Sheriff but also the DuPage County Sheriff and the Cook County Sheriff and the Kane County Sheriff and every other sheriff. And what...what these gentlemen said is you are driving them out of business because they can't have their employees spend that much time making sure they're being trained by each individual sheriff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Sangmeister may close.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well,...what you say may or may not be true. The private detectives obviously want to be able to do this service, they're willing to submit themselves to the sheriff in the county in which the service is going to be made. If that means they got to run all over the district to your county and my county to get qualified, that's their problem. Okay? At least it will have some additional people that can serve process when the sheriff doesn't get it done in time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Sangmeister moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 497. 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. House Bill 561, Senator Joyce.

Joyce-Degnan. Senator Degnan seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 561 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 561.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is simply the same amendment that we...we have offered on other pension bills that makes clear that...that any hospital insurance benefits that are being offered by pension plans shall not be guaranteed by the Illinois State Constitution. I move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Schuneman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 561. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

I think Amendment No. 3 is the State mandate's provision. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Joyce moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 561. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 598, Senator Bloom. House Bill 605, Senator Fawell. House Bill 650, Senator...Senator Fawell, do you wish...Senator Fawell wishes to have House Bill 650 brought back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 650...605.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by...Senator Keats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Fawell agreed to accept this amendment. What it does is several things. It deals with where you have an elementary school district that is...does not have contiguous boundaries with a high school district. This sets up a viable method for students who've all attended the same elementary district to attend the same high school district. I would appreciate it being placed on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Keats moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 605. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. On the Order of the Recall Sheet, we have House Bill 598. Senator Bloom seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 598 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 598, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Bloom.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President. There were a couple of problems with this bill that were brought to my attention, this amendment corrects those problems. The first problem had to do with the fact that the University of Chicago needed more specific language for their university police. The second part of the amendment makes it clear that private universities would be empowered to have campus cops but only those private universities that had a certificate of approval by the Board of Higher Education and were accredited by the North Central Association. Answer any questions, otherwise, seek the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Bloom seeks the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 598. 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. House Bill 650. Senator Barkhausen seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bills 650 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 650.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and members, Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 650 is an amendment agreed upon between the Realtor's Association, the Department of Registration and Education and the time share industry...real estate time sharing industry which this bill would affect. It would for the first time regulate this industry and require disclosure. The amendment makes certain technical changes to the bill. As I say, it's agreed upon and I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Barkhausen moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 650. 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. House Bill 792, Senator Lemke. Senator Lemke, 792? Seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 792 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 792.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does is...it deletes some obsolete language from the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act which puts a date in there which is past the date and adds the language that the system under consultation with the Secretary of State shall made...be made available to the public or to the governmental entities or agencies to computerize text of the rules adopted in compliance with the codification system by Section 7 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 792. 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. House Bill 971, Senator Barkhausen. Senator Barkhausen seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill...971 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 971.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and members, Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 971 seeks to...to add a...as a...provision that would add an aggravating factor to our Death Penalty Statute. It's identical to Senate Bill 632 which passed this Body by a comfortable margin, but having sat through two full four-hour sessions in the House Judiciary II Committee without having this bill called, I feel no alternative but to seek to have this same Senate bill amended onto this House bill, House Bill 971. Would be happy to answer any questions, but it is identical to the earlier Senate bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGHEISTER:

Yeah, Senator Barkhausen, is this the one again that I have some fear about as far as disrupting that...well, okay, then we know what we're talking about. Once again, I would

say to the Body that I really don't think we ought to do this because I think we're jeopardizing our...our death Statute by making it so broad that every...every possible death case that a state's attorney is going to handle is going to be eligible for the death penalty...I mean, every homicide, and I just don't think we ought to be doing that. I think probably that's one of the reasons it died over in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. Well, this is a bad idea, it flies in the face of what the Supreme Court has said. There should be specific guidelines regarding...death penalty cases. This virtually would allow the death penalty in each and every case and take away those guidelines that we have in our law today and that the Supreme Court says...it needs for...for guidance and that each state should have for guidance, and this...this flies in the face of that. We have our laws on the books today and people who should be getting the death penalty, do get the death penalty pursuant to the eight...eight lists...eight set of guidelines that are...are presently in the law. This adds one that is very vague. It probably, very...very likely could be found to be unconstitutional because it is so vague and...and is really totally unnecessary. So, I would...I think it's a bad idea, I join Senator Sangmeister in opposition to this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Barkhausen moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 971...Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

May I close?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Well, sure.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Briefly... 'cause we did... in deference to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we did have this debate before and they did raise the objection of possible vagueness. I, at that time, pointed it out... pointed out that the language is largely based on a similar provision in the Florida Death Penalty Statute which has been upheld by the Supreme Court in Florida and also that the U. S. Supreme Court in... deciding whether to review the case denied certiorari,... thereby upholding... implicitly upholding the constitutionality. So, I... I think the vagueness of this has been judged by the Supreme Court both in Florida and by the U. S. Supreme Court and has been upheld. This is the... the same debate that we had before and I would urge the same support for this amendment that the Senate gave first time around to Senate Bill 632 and would urge adoption. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 971. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is... a roll call has been requested. Will all the members please be in their seats. On the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 971, those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Vote me Aye. (Machine cutoff)... voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 35, the Nays are 22, none voting Present. Amendment No. 2 having received the majority vote is declared adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 1034, Senator Welch. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1034 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hear-

ing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1034.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Sangmeister.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Sangmeister. Senator Sangmeister wishes to withdraw Amendment No. 3. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 1067, Senator Lemke. Senator Lenke seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1067 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...Senator Lemke, what's...

SENATOR LEMKE:

...voted on the prevailing side...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Well, let's get...let's read the bill, for let's...put the bill in...in action. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1067. Senator Lemke, for what purpose?

SENATOR LEMKE:

We want to make a motion to Table Amendment No...No. 1, having voted on the prevailing side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Having voted on the prevailing side, Senator Lemke wishes to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 is adopted. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion to reconsider passes. Senator Lenke now wishes to Table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1067. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The

Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this amendment does is replaces Amendment No. 1 with the correct technical changes. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I'd like to hear a detailed explanation of what this amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

I'm sorry, Senator Marovitz, what...

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I...I would like to hear a detailed explanation of what this amendment does. It is my understanding that the chief judge of the probate court is opposed to this bill and opposed to this amendment. I'd like to hear a detailed explanation of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

It's my understanding he's not opposed to the amendment, Senator Marovitz, but if you would like, I will take all the amendments off of this bill and pass it out of this to the House and then...become law. So, I would say that we just...this amendment does exactly what Amendment No. 2...1 did, is makes technical changes. You want to vote on the bill at the time, fine, but you're not going to defeat this bill here on the amendment stage. All we're trying to do and put it in correct technical form. You want to argue on the

bill on 3rd reading, that's another thing, but...this amendment is what the parties want it to put the form...the bill in the correct technical form.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I'm not trying to argue the merits of the bill, I asked a simple question. I'd like a detailed explanation of what the amendment does. I don't know who you're talking about in regards to "the parties." I don't know who "the parties" are, I'd like to know what the amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

...all this amendment does is...is affects pre-1955 wills and not subsequent 1955 wills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, isn't that what the bill does? That's what the bill does...without the amendment. Now I want to know what the amendment does. The bill affects pre-1955 wills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What happened was the Amendment No. 1 was...amended both wills before and after. We...this is a correction to Amendment No. 1 that just amends...it talks about wills prior to 1955. It's a technical amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

...all right. I'll...I'll fight the bill on 3rd reading, I guess. I...I'm obviously not going to get an explanation,

I'll fight...I'll fight it on 3rd reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Lenke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1067. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3, by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does, it amends the Adoption Act, provides that a failure to maintain a reasonable degree of interest concerning or responsibility as a child's welfare or failure to make reasonable efforts to correct the condition which were the basis for the removal of the child, and to make reasonable progress towards the return of the child within twelve months after the child has been adjudicated a neglected or dependent minor shall not be excused by financial inability or financial hardship alone. I ask for this adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1067. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 1083, Senator Nedza. Senator Nedza? House Bill 1106, Senator Watson. Senator Watson, do you wish to recall House Bill 1106 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment? Senator Sangmeister's amendment. House Bill 1159, Senator Joyce. Jerome Joyce...House Bill 1182, Senator Lemke. Senator Lemke?

HB 1306
Recalled

Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1192 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1192.

SECRETARY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank...thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 extends the effective date...or implementation date by six months. The Act will now take effect on January 1st of next year instead of...I'm sorry, July 1st of next year instead of January 1st. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Degnan moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1182. 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. House Bill 1188, Senator Berman. House Bill 1306, Senator Jeremiah Joyce. Senator Joyce seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1306 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1306. WAND-TV Decatur, requests permission to videotape today's Session. Is...leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 on 1306 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an amendment which has been agreed upon by the...firefighters and the Illinois Hospital Association and the Illinois State Medical Society, and embodies...a...an agreement by the medical providers that they will not attempt to collect these charges from officers when the provider consents to an assumption of liability by the city. I would...move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Schuneman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1306. 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. House Bill 1410, Senator Marovitz. House Bill 1445, Senator Luft. Senator Luft...House...Senator Luft...House Bill 1470. Senator Luft seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1445 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1445.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment is the same amendment as Senate Bill 369 which we passed out of the Senate some time ago which brings the alternative retirement annuity to the Department of Corrections security employees and makes them...in the same standard as other State

employees who already receive the alternative retirement annuity. I move for...its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Poshard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House...Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1445. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

House Bill 1478...3rd reading, I'm sorry. House Bill 1478. Senator Smith seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1478 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1478.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Smith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 deletes the original bill and maintains the provision made by the Amendment...No.1. The Amendment of No. 2 making the new bill is that it would especially require the Department of Aging to apply the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act to all purchases, contracts and other obligations or expenditures of funds by the Department of Aging, believing that House Bill...1478 as it now reads is so broad in scope to affect even the Federal monies which simply are distributed to...thirteen local service agencies throughout the State. And the Department of Aging offered this amendment to modify the language so that Federal past due monies would not be affected by this bill. With this amendment, the

Department of Aging would not oppose this bill. And...I move for the adoption of...Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. At...we're not going to oppose these amendments at this time, but we had some big problems with this bill in committee, and Senator Smith recalls some of the problems that we talked about. I think the Senator is trying to...to respond to some of the concerns in the committee. We haven't had a chance to look at these amendments. We're not going to oppose them at this time, but we want the Senator to understand that we'd like to get together and talk about what you're really trying to do here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Smith moves the adoption of Amendment...of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1478. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3, by Senator Smith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 3 with the approval of the Department of Aging clarifies the limits of circumstances in which the Department of Aging is required to apply the provisions of the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act by deleting certain vague terminology, "other obligations," in Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Smith moves the

adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1479. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 1510, Senator Vadalabene. Senator Vadalabene seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1510 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. And on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1510.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Vadalabene.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to 1510 is a clarification of the...prohibition section...of the Act which states that any...against any person licensed as a distiller or wine manufacturer being issued a retailer's license, and I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Vadalabene moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1510. 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. House Bill 1800, Senator Berman. House Bill 1801, Senator Barkhausen. Senator Barkhausen seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 1801 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no

objection, House Bill 1801, on the Order of 2nd Reading.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and members, Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1801 is identical to a bill that was passed by this Chamber a couple of years ago and ties in well with the substance of 1901 which calls upon the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs in its future economic planning to consider the occupational needs of this State. This amendment essentially codifies what the department is doing with its existing task force or commission on science and technology. It provides for a membership of a kind which the Governor has appointed. It sets forth the functions of this group which are basically identical to those which the...task force is now undertaking, and I believe and the department believes that it will further the cooperation which we are seeking to foster between universities on the one hand and private businesses which can use research and...and technology that is going on within our universities. The...as I say, the department favors it, it basically supports what they're doing already. I know of no opposition and would urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Barkhausen moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1801. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 1949, Senator Schuneman. House

Bill...2103, Senator Lemke. Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 2103 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2103. Senator Lemke.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SECRETARY:

That's the one marked A, Senator?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does is amends the Juvenile Code to provide that...that the court when it gives supervision can give up...give a detention period for up to...not to exceed seven days. It's a good amendment, I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2103. 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 Schuneman, you wish to go back to go back to 1949?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

If possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman seeks leave of the Body to return House

Bill 1949 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1949.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by...Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank...thank you, Mr. President. This is an amendment to the bill that affects the Real Estate Brokers Licensing Act, and it simply makes some corrections in the fees which were intended to be included in the rewrite of the Act that we passed a year and a half or two years ago. So I would move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Schuneman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1949. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. House Bill 2278, Senator Marovitz. Senator Marovitz seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 2278 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2278.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2278 just registers

HB 2444
Recalled

those people who are engaged in the practice of environmental sanitation and...and says that those people must be registered after 12-31-86, and I would ask the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2279. 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. House Bill 2444, Senator Rupp. Senator Rupp seeks leave of the Body to bring House Bill 2444 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 2444.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Rupp.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment establishes a dedicated fund for certain filing and...transactional fees for the Department of Insurance. It does not, and I'd like to repeat that, it doesn't contain any assessment formula. The amendment also clearly states exactly what the monies of the fund are to be spent on. The fund will be used only to assist the department in defraying expenses incurred in the analysis, investigation and examination of the financial conditions of insurance companies. The problem of insolvency is getting to be considerable and this is one effort to provide additional means by which they can do some extra examination. The amendment also provides that any excess buildup

of the money in the fund at the end of the fiscal year would be transferred back into the General Revenue Fund. The language as understood would remove any industry opposition to the establishment of this type of dedicated fund. I recommend its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Question of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator Rupp, is this the program that Director Washburn had some significant interest in over the past couple of years?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

It's not exactly, that's what I was...trying to emphasize, that this is not an assessment type formula against all insurance companies. The insurance companies are agreeing to this. It's just a fund that will be built up from certain filing and certain fees on...on some transactions in order to provide additional money for examiners for companies to prevent insolvencies. If there's any money left at the end of the time, that money does not build up, which was what the case before would have been and it goes back into the general fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Does...does the fund which is created, apparently the Insurance Financial Regulation Fund, is that subject to appropriation by the General Assembly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Yes...yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

If there's no further discussion, Senator Rupp moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2444. 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. House Bill 2525. Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2525 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 2525.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this bills does...the Legislators Reference Bureau's annual...bill making revisory corrections and what this amendment does is...it adds some new revisory corrections which the Reference Bureau has found. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there...is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2525. 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 Lemke, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LEMKE:

I understand that the staff, everything has been...resolved as far as House Bill 231. We have leave to go back to that...to put the amendment on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 231 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 231.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does is amends to House Bill 231...Senate...Senate Bills 531, 532, 534, 35, 39, 544, 549 and 550 which are technical...bills that we passed out of here 59 to nothing. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Lemke moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 231. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further...that was Amendment No. 3. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 4, by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this does is amends House Bill 231 to put the...bill

that we passed out of here contributing to the delinquency of the minor...juvenile which passed out of this Body on the Agreed Bill List. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Lemke has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 231. Is there any discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just...I sought recognition on the other amendment as well. I didn't quite understand the explanation. Were...was Amendment No. 3 or 4 any bill...bill that we defeated? Would you kindly explain Amendment No. 4.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

All the amendments that are put on are bills that passed out of this Body 59 to nothing.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Then what's the purpose of the amendment?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

Never were posted for call in the House by the chairman.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? If not, Senator Lemke has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 231. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. All right, before we move to House bills 2nd reading which will effectively conclude our business, we'll go to the Order of Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

(Machine cutoff)...resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Hold it, Mr. Secretary. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President. Are my ears deceiving me, we're going to resolutions and then quit?

PRESIDENT:

No...no...no, 2nd reading.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Okay, thank you.

PRESIDENT:

I said...I said before we get there, we will do the adjournment resolution so everybody knows when we're coming back and then we'll proceed through House bills 2nd and that should end our otherwise happy day. Mr. Secretary, resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 77 offered by Senator Savickas.

(Secretary reads SJR 77)

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I move its...I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Savickas has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 77. All in favor of the motion to suspend indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Savickas now moves the

adoption of the adjournment resolution. All in favor of adoption indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. If I can have the attention of the membership, the adjournment resolution calls for us to return to Springfield on Monday and it calls for the hour of ten o'clock. Senator Philip and I have discussed...you have all received a copy of the Agreed Bill List and it's also obviously on the Calendar. It is our intent to convene the Session at ten, and the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary indicate it will take roughly an hour and a half to two to read all those bills in. And so we will utilize the first two hours to read the bills in and have a roll call on those bills at the conclusion of Monday's business, so that effectively, if the membership would be here at noon, we will be able to start on the regular Calendar. The procedure to...to knock bills off or to vote...Nay on...on any is outlined in the memorandum and that...that procedure will be available until five o'clock on Monday. Channel 20 has requested permission to tape. Is leave granted? Without objection, leave is granted.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

PRESIDENT:

All right, with leave of the Body, we'll move to the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, top of page 63 on the Calendar, is House Bill 48, Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 48.

(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 Senators Bloom and Luft.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President and fellow Senators. What the amendment does is essentially address an issue we have in our...in our more mature inner cities and in the context of enterprise zones and foreign trade zones. It is similar to...it is similar to the thrust of Senate Bill 665. Basically, it says to businesses who would qualify within these two zones that would either create two hundred new jobs or save or retain two thousand existing jobs, they get certain sales tax breaks. Now, the other part, it is also conditioned, and primarily trying to address the...conditions as they obtain with the old Republic Steel Plant, now LTV. It's conditioned as well on the local government providing the trigger that would give the sales tax breaks by the local government providing its own sales tax breaks. That's

the...long and short of it. I'll answer any questions, otherwise, seek its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Bloom has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 48. Discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President...excuse me, a couple of questions, if I might, to the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Did you indicate, Senator Bloom, for what company this amendment is well designed? I'm sorry, I did not hear, would you be so kind as to repeat?

PRESIDENT:

If I can ask the members to be in their seats and ask the staff to take the conferences off the Floor, we will be able to discharge our responsibility in a more orderly fashion. Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Okay. It's primarily designed to help LTV or, as I said, the company that bought the old Republic Steel Plant, but the mechanism and I...I failed to state it, the mechanism is there for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to certify other businesses. This is the result of meetings that LTV has had with both the Governor's...the Governor and, I think, the Mayor of Chicago and other...and council people in Chicago.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Was there any commitment of any kind made by LTV with respect to their course of action if this tax break should be adopted? And, obviously, one of the things that I have in

mind, Senator Bloom, is a couple of years ago many of us remember that with some trepidation, but in a sense with enthusiasm also, we adopted a particular tax break to encourage U.S. Steel to continue their rail mill on the south side and then they just up and left anyway and there was a great deal of anger and frustration as a result of that. So, is there any sense of commitment on the part of LTV that...that this will keep them around employing Illinoisans?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Okay, let...let me give a short answer and perhaps Senator Dawson, who has been a key player in this process, can expand on it. The short answer is the State has not committed to certifying this and LTV has not made any long-range commitments. They just said we want to stay there and that's why you'll notice the language is triggered to creating two hundred new jobs and retaining two thousand existing jobs, and I believe there are a little over three, four thousand people working there now, so they have to make the commitment in that sense, but there were no promises on either side. This is primarily a legislative initiative and, Mr. President, I would yield then to Senator Dawson to expand further on this. Mr. President, hello...do you think Senator Kustra can talk with his hands in his pockets? Mr. President, I would defer then...to the rest of my answer to Senator Dawson on conditions.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dawson.

SENATOR DAWSON:

Senator Netsch, these meetings have been going on for approximately two months now and LTV Steel employs approximately thirty-six hundred people on their rolls right not, and with their coming forward because of the competition of

a...another plant that they have that does the very similar type of products in another State, and what they're trying to do is keep this plant here competitive with that one there, and they're not saying that they're going to shut out, close down or anything else. What they want to do is they want to stay in the State of Illinois, they want to keep their thirty-six hundred employees and pay their taxes in the State of Illinois, but they have to be kept competitive with their other plant, and this is what this whole thrust of this is all about.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

One...one more question to either of you and...and then just a comment. I...I'll make the comment now since Senator Dawson just responded. I'm sure he is more than sensitive to the...the concern I was raising because it was also in his district that the other incident took place and I think he felt as betrayed, if not more so, than anyone else, so I...I raised that only because sometimes we do things that...that end up doing nothing except costing the State money. That is my last question. Is there any indication...does anyone have any basis on which to estimate the cost that this bill would have to the State?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

The Department of Revenue which assisted Senate Democratic Staff in drawing this up did not furnish me with that kind of information. Suffice it to say that Senator...well, suffice to say that they...they are not giving away the store and this is conditioned on a local initiative as well. The problem is your statutory overhead. In Canton, Ohio, it's about four million for them. In Illinois, it's seventeen

million. They'd like to commit to...expand some of their plant, as Senator Dawson and I understand it, and I think Senator Dawson has told them in pretty earthy terms exactly how he felt about the Wisconsin Steel situation, so I...I think that they're very amenable to staying.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Very briefly, Mr. President. I stand in support of this amendment. As Senator Bloom pointed out that the question is whether this steel company will remain in business in Chicago in the Hammond area or whether they're going to move, and the...this site that we're talking about is the old Republic Steel site and, unfortunately, that area has been faced with a tremendous downturn in the economy, a number of people have been layed off, maybe, hopefully, this will supply some economic input as...to have this company remain in Illinois, and I strong...stand in strong support of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator...there further discussion? Senator Dawson.

SENATOR DAWSON:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we've heard all the talk about Saturn and every place else trying to bring them into the State of Illinois, well, here's a company that employs thirty-six hundred people and it's here right now in place. We're not chasing after somebody to come in here, they're here now; and all I can say is we ask for a favorable roll call to keep them here because they pay approximately a hundred and eleven million dollars in salaries every year, and as far as I'm concerned, it's one heck of a lot of money that we already have here for our employees and fifty-two percent of those people live in the City of Chicago and eighty-two percent of their employees live in

HB 142
2nd Reading

Cook County itself, so they're basically...they're almost all Illinois employees working for an Illinois plant, and I ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator...Senator Bloom, is this your amendment? Senator Bloom moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 48. 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. 142, Senator Bloom. House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 142, Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 142.

(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. 157, Senator Davidson. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 157, Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 157.

(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 Rupp.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rupp. Senator Rupp seeks leave to withdraw the amendment. All right, the...that amendment is withdrawn.

Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Withdraw it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins...withdraws amendment. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito. It's an effective date, I'm told.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President and members. This is a technical amendment. It changes...it adds an effective date to take effect on July 1st, 1986, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 157. 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. 296, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom, 296. Senator Bloom on the Floor? 392, Senator Lemke. Senator Lemke on the Floor? All right, Senator...House Bill 392. House bills 2nd reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

HB 567
2nd Reading

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 392.

(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 Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

Can we table that amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, why don't you just...Senator Lemke wishes to have Amendment No. 1 withdrawn...amendment is withdrawn. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. 567, Senator Philip. All right, on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 567, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip. Senator Philip, before you did that, WEEK-TV Channel 25 has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1 lowers it down to the

Governor's level of 2.7 billion dollars. I move the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to...House Bill 567. 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)

No...or...Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Collins, Hall, Chew, Smith, Carroll, Zito, Netsch, Luft, Demuzio, Savickas and Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 567 is...it simply says that thirty percent of the new bonding authorization shall be used for rehabilitation of homes for low and moderate income families, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Collins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 567. Is there any discussion? Senator Philip. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's just my suggestion that this is a...not a good amendment and it kind of destroys the effectiveness of the Governor's program and I suggest that we vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Collins has moved the adoption of amendment...Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator DeAngelis. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Is that thirty percent minimum, thirty percent maximum or thirty percent on the head?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thirty percent of the new...the billion dollar bonding would be used for rehabilitation of low and moderate income housing...at least...at least.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I'd like to reask my question. Is that thirty percent minimum, maximum or right on the head?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Minimum.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

That's not what the amendment says.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Thank you, Mr. President. As I sit here in this seat during this Session of the General Assembly, I watch time

after time the black members of this Chamber offering good amendments and too often they are construed as black and white issues. Too often we sit here and say, well, there goes another black amendment. Well, let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, this amendment has no color. This is an amendment for all our citizens of the State of Illinois. I have poor people in my district, I have rich people and I have moderate income, and I'll tell you, the moderate income and the low income are as much entitled to this program as anyone else and they need the money as much as anyone else, and I would hope that my friends in this Senate would listen to this amendment, not consider it on racial, black on white lines. It's a good amendment for all our citizens, all our constituents and I'd hope that we would adopt it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEBUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President and...and I would like to get some attention on what I'm about to say because the genesis of this...one of the major problems that we have when we talk about Build Illinois, for example, and the problems that we have when we talk about building our own communities is the absence of the kind of training programs that permitted those communities to deteriorate in the first place. Now, anyone who's familiar with the growth and the building in the City of Chicago can tell you that a large number of those persons who were building twenty, thirty years ago came from my community. They can also tell you that today they don't come from my community. So that the destruction and deterioration that takes place as a consequence of this and takes properties off the tax rolls and takes people off the tax payrolls and takes them into the tax consumer rolls, that roll which we say we're concerned about, those are the people who would be involved in the rebuilding of

this community and in the rebuilding of those neighborhoods that have deteriorated. Let me tell you something about my personal experience. My area includes sort of a microcosm of a major metropolitan area. I happen to live in Hyde Park. Hyde Park is sort of the...an...an upper-middle class with the University of Chicago in the center of it. Just adjacent to it...just adjacent to it on one side is...is Kenwood, on the other is Woodlawn. Kenwood is where the old mansions were, the Swifts and the Armours and so forth. Just across the street on Forty-seventh Street is absolute destruction, absolute. On the south side, on the opposite end of the mid-way where every year the block at Sixty-fourth and Minnerva used to win the Block Beautiful contest in the City of Chicago up until twenty years ago destroyed, absolutely destroyed and the children whose parents built that area cannot get into the business of rebuilding. What we're about to do with this amendment is put some people in the posture to become taxpayers and to begin to rejuvenate our cities and our communities, that's what it does; and I...I would say to you that Senator Darrow is absolutely right that the consequences of this bill have no color, although in the...in the...in the causation and in the effect of putting people together, there is some color...to it, there's no question about that. There's also the sex area. There'll be females involved in this thirty percent and if it's not..., Senator, it certainly ought to be, and I would suggest to you, if that's the kind of change that we made, let's make it on the spot and get on with this. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, what you're doing is you're simply asking IHDA to do what IHDA was created for. You know, we talk about

the American way and all this. The point is, IHDA is not building homes where they should be building or not giving the money for them. I'm three hundred miles away from Chicago, but I have the same problem. They're too busy giving it to the other people. Let's get people where they can get a home that's decent. We give all this money every year and you look around and you say, what has IHDA done? IHDA hasn't done anything for the people that it should. We're all citizens and I don't know how anybody could object to that. You're simply...they shouldn't have to be mandated to do it, that's what their job is and they're not doing it. This is a good amendment. It should be a larger percentage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I think if someone looks at the record, one will discover that IHDA is spending a lot of money in this area. I believe it runs between eighteen and twenty-eight percent the last couple of years. Now, the money in this area has been spent for this and I think a majority of the multifamily units they've been involved in with last year were rehab. No one is against rehab. but the cases have to be justified. There has to be merit. I think one of the things that this country and our constituents are fed up with is artificial quotas. If they've got a good program, let them present it and let it be judged on its merits and let it be funded on merits, not on an artificial quota. Let them rise or fall on whether they're good ideas and whether they make sense regardless of whether they're located in my area or your area or anybody's area. If they don't make sense, they ought not to be done; if they make sense, they ought to be done. We don't need artificial quotas. That's one of the things that is ruining this country.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I had not really thought of a thirty percent set-aside on IHDA's bonding authority as a quota in the sense in which you're using the expression, Senator Schaffer. It seems to me what it does do is to set forth a public policy commitment and that one is something that is really exceedingly important, particularly for those of us who live in urban areas and, most particularly, those of us who live in Chicago. What I see happening with IHDA, not exclusively, I fully concede, but all too often is that the projects that developers want to develop are nice high-rise projects on the north side where I live. We don't need them. We do not think they are appropriate uses of tax exempt bonds. What we would like to do is to see more of the housing stock of the City of Chicago and the other cities in this State preserved before it does decline. If I remember my figure correctly, I think Chicago is losing a net of seven thousand units of housing every year. That is why we have the kinds of problems...we have in terms of density, in terms of other housing going into deterioration. That doesn't make any sense. A lot of those units are salvageable. What we are saying is, IHDA, do not come into the lake front and build fancy high-rises but use your tax exempt, subsidized authority to preserve that housing stock which can, indeed, be preserved, particularly when the developers know that they've got to address that problem. I think that really is what this amendment is designed to say and I think it is appropriate public policy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in support of Amendment No. 2. When

the director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee...or Executive Committee, I beg your pardon, I asked at that point what...what do we need a billion dollars for? Why a billion? And it was indicated that there was an allocation suggested at least by the housing development authority to provide for some four hundred million or four something in single-family units and the balance, five hundred and ninety or six hundred million, in multifamily units. So, I think this amendment has the right direction. Let's instead of cutting the program in two, let's cut it in three and say that a vital part of the housing stock is in desperate need of some rehabilitation and so we can at once provide for multifamily units, for single-family mortgages and, finally, for some low interest rehabilitation money. I think the amendment is a good idea. It has not been proved to me to be unworkable. Obviously, this dialogue is going to continue over the next week. In the meantime, I think we'd be better advised to put the amendment on and indicate to the development authority that, yes, indeed, we are interested in some allocation, pick a number, but it doesn't seem at all unreasonable to me to divide the program into three parts and this is a very vital part, and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion for a first time? Senator DeAngelis, for a second time.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, is there...are there any other speakers 'cause I'm looking for some information?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

No, you're the...you're it.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, for one thing, on a point of personal privilege. The questions that are being addressed don't pertain to any

racial issues and I resent the implications, not on my on behalf but on the rest of the Body. Now, when you question an amendment that doesn't do what the sponsor says it does, that someone has got to jump up right away and say that the reason somebody opposes the amendment is for racial reasons. I know fully what IHDA does and I know that it does not in any shape, form or manner cross racial lines...doesn't destroy racial lines. It does not attempt to discriminate; in fact, I have quite of bit of IHDA housing in my own district and I know what it does. Now, the...the fact is that this amendment, and I want to point out to it again, 'cause the first thing that IHDA has got to do to implement any change in public policy is to be able to sell the bonds. Now, if you put an amendment on it that doesn't make it possible to sell the bonds, then you haven't served anybody's purposes. The second thing is, I'd like to point out, people have talked about high-rises, the fact of the matter is that less than six percent of the IHDA money has been used for high-rise development, and we have a lot of this to-do about high-rise, and it's been six percent of their money that's done it. Now, I have a question of the Chair in that I can't find the piece of paper I'm looking for. Does this amendment track with Amendment No. 1?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMOZIO)

Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, it just...just to...one, I am convinced that it will track; but beside that, to cavalierly suggest that any attempt to modify or...encourage a different program direction somehow impacts on the marketability of these bonds, I think is an assumption we ought not readily assume. I'm perfectly prepared, as we have done in the past, to talk and negotiate with the folks from IHDA and if, indeed, in the opinion of their bond counsel or some others, it may well

impact, then, obviously, your point is well taken. We do not in any way wish to...make these bonds less desirable or...or nonmarketable, but I think it's...it's too facile an answer to say, holy smoke, you do this and it's nonmarketable; because I'll just tell you, if you'll recall, we had the same discussion in the Executive Committee with respect to the...the project of building for single people, and it...it was said that perhaps that would impact on the marketability. The fact is we had the opportunity then to sit with the folks from IHDA and we were able to construct what we hope will be a very progressive and reasonable program in that direction which they did not feel then would impact on the marketability. So, I wouldn't cavalierly dismiss it on that basis. I think it's worth a look.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator DeAngelis, the amendment, in fact, is...is in order. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, and I'd...if it is, I'd like to point out something else, and I hate to take the time of the Body but...this is what I'm talking about, President Rock. There are certain other set-asides in this bill as is. Now, if you don't clarify whether that thirty percent is a minimum number or a maximum number, if you take the accumulative total of the set-asides, it's perhaps...perhaps that you might find the inability to go to the market, 'cause you got a hundred million for solar heating, you got a hundred million for mortgages that are in arrears. Is this thirty percent of what? And I just want to make out that point. You can vote any way you want.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Very

briefly, my esteemed colleague, Senator Schaffer, threw out that old buzzword quotas. Well, I will tell you, Senator Schaffer, this is a quota. What we are saying to you and what we are saying to the authority is that only seventy percent of these can be built by the fat cat developers along the lake shore, and seventy percent of these projects that would otherwise be built anyway without this because they have sound, economic bases and availability to the conventional markets for funding, only seventy percent of those can be built by those fat cats. That's the quota we're putting on them, seventy percent not one hundred percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Collins may close.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. And let me say...answer to the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...whoa...whoa...just a minute,...hold on a minute, Senator Collins. Senator Philip, do you wish to...to...to speak on amendment...Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and...Gentlemen of the Senate. It is my bill and I'd like to say just a few words, some observations, and what this bill in effect does is limit the amount of money IHDA could spend. Now under the Governor's program as introduced, they could hypothetically spend all the money on moderate and low income housing. What your amendment effectively says, they could only spend thirty percent, period. So, if you're interested in...in moderate and low income housing, I...I would suggest to you not voting for this limitation on what they can spend, and if you've got a good project in your district or in your area, go to IHDA and the administration and make a proposal. We ought to defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Collins may close.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, let me...for a start with Senator...no...Philip's remarks. That is not true. It is thirty percent and, Senator DeAngelis, let me answer your question at the same time, this amendment is very specific. It says thirty percent of the increased bonding authorization which is that one billion dollars, thirty percent of that will go for rehab. It did not exclude any other developments...new developments for low and moderate income housing. I would hope that the remaining...seventy percent of that thirty more percent would be for new construction of low and moderate income housing. Let me say to the marketability question, I am not careless enough to introduce an amendment and not make specific contact with the agency. I talked with the attorney for this agency and talked about the problems of risk involved and there are any a number of ways that they can do and order that this is not an undue risk because it can be sold in combinations with rehabilitation and new construction bond issued. So, there is no problem there at all. The other question is, we talk about the need for doing this, this has nothing to do with minorities. It most certainly has something to do with revitalizing urban areas and putting dilapidated properties back on the tax rolls which would, in fact, provide for a...a greater and stronger economic base for local...units of government and is something that we need because the State of Illinois cannot carry the...burden for local units of government. So, this is the way of putting property back on the tax roll. And, secondly, it will provide incentives for other types of investments in communities, and let me tell you, I live in one of those type communities that was once totally a community gone down, and now because of people like myself and other citizens got together and with

banks in that area started rehabing a community which is now one of the most famous communities in the City of Chicago; and annually, all of the people from across the State and even out of the country come into that community just to go through our homes and see the kind of rehab. that we've done, and it most certain...certainly has stimulated interest into our areas and in that area most people can, in fact, get loans for almost anything that they want to do. So, I say this is a good amendment and there are going to be Conference Committees, we can work on it some more. I move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Collins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 567. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. A roll call has been requested. Senator Collins has moved...moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 567. Those wishing to vote 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 29, none voting Present. Amendment No. 2 fails. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567 is an attempt to allow the Legislature to have an overview of the operations of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. What we do with Amendment No. 3 is to mandate, beginning in July 1 of '86, that all expenses of the authority be payable soley from the funds appropriated by the

General Assembly and no liability for such expenses shall be incurred beyond the dollars appropriated. Also beginning in...July 1 of '86, the Illinois Housing Development Authority shall pay into the State Treasury all dollars received or accumulated for their expenses except for funds appropriated by the General Assembly. If there aren't any questions, Mr. President, I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567...just a moment. Is there any discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I'm sorry, Mr. President, I will try not to snap my fingers at you again. What...what this does, in effect...demands that we have an annual appropriation for Build Illinois. We ought to call this amendment the "pork amendment," so we can all come back here annually and put our pork in and everybody can bring your...little goodies back to the district. You talk about a lousy idea, a lousy program, this is it. You know, we ought to let the Governor set the priorities and do what's right, and...we ought to get out of the business of pork. We ought to defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise wholeheartedly in favor of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567. This is...is a very important amendment. Yesterday...I...I was attempting to try and get some information...and I would like some order, please, 'cause I'm not going to talk...try and outtalk all...all of the noise in here, but...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, we will make an attempt to get some order. Can we have some order for Senator Collins. Will the members be in their seats. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

...yesterday, as I was attempting to try and...and get some information in reference to the...the amendment which was just defeated, I found that it...it was very strange that the director of that department was away out of the country. It struck me mighty strange that any director this time of year, at this critical time in...in...in State Government that would...could afford the luxury of being out of the country, and...and...and what Senator Luft is trying to do is to make that a...agency more accountable. It's to get it out of its ivory...tower down there in the City of Chicago, overlooking the lake, spending, someone has said, all they way up to a million dollars...a year on rent and God knows what on other expenses, and no one knows what they do with the money and so what he's trying to do is make that agency accountable and maybe then, just maybe, I won't have to introduce those kind of amendments that just failed, because maybe they will carry out the original mandate by which that agency was created. So, I...I...I recommend heartily that we adopt Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMOZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, frankly, I don't really get to uptight about IHDA because every time anybody in my area...my district says they want an IHDA project, the citizens form a committee and hire a lawyer and protest and we don't do it. So, you know, the quotas really don't affect me. My people, rightly or wrongly, don't want anything to do with it. I...I really have to say that, frankly, when you look at this and you know that the...the cumbersome apparatus already in place without

putting the political...shall we say, give and take into the process, I think you're talking about something that would really do harm to a process which...while it may not have had a big impact in my part of the State, I think has had a good impact in other parts of the State. If we start voting rehab. house by rehab. house and covering ourselves in glory like our House colleagues did a couple of weeks ago when they had that feeding frenzy one rather ennobled Friday, I don't think we want to do that. I think most of the people who understand IDHA know that they have been responsive to the political pressures to the extent that they should be responsive. Bear in mind, IDHA is funded by the sale of bonds. You can't sell bonds to support pork barrel junk, and if you want to sell pork barrel junk, you're going to have to be a traditionalist and do it from the general revenue where the taxpayer has no defense.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I move the...previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Geo-Karis, there's only one speaker left. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We are, today...engaging in the buzzword amendments, I guess. This hasn't got a thing in the world to do with projects, not one whit. Everybody understands, I hope, the operation of the housing development authority; indeed, one has to make application and one has to prove financial and economic feasibility and go...it has to be financially responsible and on and on and on. You cannot assign projects to IHDA. All this amendment says is that who is IHDA? Why should they and they alone, as a State agency, have a budget

for their operating expenses that is not subject to the scrutiny of the General Assembly through the appropriations process? Why? Why not cause them to come annually before the General Assembly as we do with every other agency of State Government and justify their expenditure and perhaps when they are justifying their expenditure, then some of these questions can be adequately addressed. Why, IHDA, are you so concentrated along the lake front? Why, IHDA, are you opposed or allegedly opposed to money for rehabilitation? Why are you opposed, IHDA, to money for those among us who are single and live in a hotel room? Those are questions we should have an answer to and I don't think subjecting their expenses, their operating budget to the annual scrutiny of the General Assembly is a bad idea at all, and I urge the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Luft may close.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to point out what we're talking about. We're talking about someone that we are giving the authorization for over billions of dollars...billions, not millions, billions of dollars. After we make this authorization, they're gone. We never see them again. We don't have any control over them. If anything goes wrong, we're out of it, and as one of the speakers from your aisle said just a few minutes ago which really scared me, he said we should be letting the Governor set priorities. Now I don't care whether it's a Republican Governor or a Democratic Governor, you know, I'm kind of for them setting priorities because I think as the Chief Executive of the State of Illinois, they should be, but it is our responsibility as legislators to provide an overview and a check and balance of that Chief Executive. Without this type measure on all the agencies and quasi State agencies of the State of

Illinois, we're left out and we abdicate our responsibility, so I would move that we adopt Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz, he was...Senator Lechowicz, he was...the gentleman had closed. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I know he was closing, my light was on before that, you probably just missed it. I won't take the time, I just want to point out that this is not the only quasi State agency that does not appear before the Appropriations Committee. The Illinois Tollway is another good one; if you're going to adopt this...procedure for IHDA, it's sure good enough for the tollway as well, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Luft has moved the...Senator Luft may close.

SENATOR LUFT:

Only one comment, Mr. President. I put in a bill to mandate this for all quasi State agencies and it failed last year. As each one comes by, I'll be more than happy to add that amendment to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567. Those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed Nay...roll call has been requested. Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 567. 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? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 29, the Nays are 28, none voting Present. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Verification of the affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip has requested a verification of the affirmative roll. Members will be in their seats. The Secretary will read the affirmative...those who voted in the affirmative.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

The following voted in the affirmative: Berman, Carroll, Chew, Collins, D'Arco, Darrow, Dawson, Degnan, Demuzio, Hall, Holmberg, Jones, Jeremiah Joyce, Jerome Joyce, Lechowicz, Lenke, Luft, Nedza, Netsch, Newhouse, O'Daniel, Poshard, Sangmeister, Savickas, Smith, Vadalabene, Welch, Zito, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Philip, do you question the presence of any member who voted in the affirmative? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Senator Chew.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Chew on the Floor? Senator Chew on the Floor? Strike his name.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz is not on the roll call. All right, Mr. Secretary, you want...or have you...have you concluded, Senator Philip?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. On the verified roll call, Senator...Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Mr. Chew just walked in the door.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

From behind me. Senator Chew has returned. Please restore him to the roll call. All right, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 29 Ayes, 28 Nays, none voting Present. Amendment No. 3 on a verified roll call is adopted. Further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

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

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have discussed with Senator Philip 570. My technical technically changed amendment just came up and I would ask Senator Philip if we could hold this one until the end of the call. Let's go through the rest of them, then we'll get back to this, and in the meantime, we can talk about my amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator Jeremiah Joyce, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

I do not like to do this, given the hour, but I would like a Democratic Caucus. Now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, that request has in the past been honored and it...I hope it will be used sparingly, but the fact is, it's probably not a bad idea. Senator Vadalabene, would you be kind enough to convene us in my office immediately?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

All right, Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.

There'll be a Democratic Caucus in the President's Office immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Well, I think we'll take advantage and ask for a Republican Caucus too...in Senator Philip's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right...Republican Caucus in Senator Philip's Office, Democratic Caucus in Senator Rock's Office. The Senate will stand in Recess for fifteen minutes.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will come to order. We're back on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. 900, Senator Netsch. 1000, Senator Jerome Joyce. 1355, Senator Sangmeister. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, page 63. (Machine cut-off)...63. Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yes, in discussing this with the parties involved, we have not been able to come up with the proper language to put this bill in shape, so I want to recommit this. I move to recommit House Bill 1355 to the committee from which it came for the purpose of putting it into interim study.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Sangmeister has moved to recommit...okay, moved to recommit House Bill 1355 to the Committee on Judiciary I. All in favor of the motion to recommit indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and it is so ordered. Senator Joyce, on 1000, do you wish to move that? Top of page 64 is House Bill 1436, Senator Joyce. 1467, Senator D'Arco. On the Order of...Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Like to recommit that bill, Mr. President. I think it's to Local Government. What...what?

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator D'Arco has moved to recommit House Bill 1467 to the Committee on Local Government. All in favor of the motion to recommit indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The bill is recommitted. 1517, Senator Holmberg. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1517. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. On the bill that we just put back into Local Government, House Bill 1467, I'd like to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the gentleman seeks leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor on House Bill 1467. Without objection, leave is granted. All right. House Bill 1517 has, I am informed by the Secretary, been read a second time. Are there any amendments, Mr. Secretary?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No amendments from the Floor.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 1529, Senator Collins. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, the middle of page 64... (machine cutoff)...I don't know what it is. All right. 1540, Senator Savickas. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1540. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1540.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

HB 1556
2nd Reading

Are there amendments from the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Savickas.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, Amendment No. 1 was promised to be drafted in committee. It was a concern about the CTA's quick-take in eminent...domain procedures. It had not been worked out by the time we had it in committee. We held the bill on 2nd until we can get the...amendment worked out. This amendment would provide that the quick-take procedure must be initiated by the City of Chicago with prior approval of the city council and subject to approval by the Metropolitan Transit Authority. The original bill authorized just the transit authority to initiate the quick-take provisions. Additionally, this amendment limits...it limits the geographical boundaries for the area for construction or extension of the rapid transit lines and it adds a five-year time limit to the quick-take. I think this meets all the objections...or all the concerns, I shouldn't say objections, all the concerns that were expressed in the committee and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Savickas has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1540. 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. 1556, Senator Keats. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1556. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 1556.

(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 Demuzio.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, first of all, want to congratulate Senator Keats on having the most anticonsumer bill of the legislative Session in House Bill 1556, and the reason I offered Amendment No. 1, I assume it's number one, is to put back into this bill some of the more safeguards for consumers. As I understand it, Senator Keats' bill will, in fact, eliminate the State truth-in-lending provisions, that this bill would repeal the Consumer Fine Act...Finance Act which repeals the surety bond requirements in the Act that are transferred to the so-called Revised Consumer Installment Loan Act. These bonding requirements constitute the only financial security which licensees maintain against the claims. This bill that he seeks to...bring forth repeals the restrictions on wage assignments that are contained in the repealed Consumer Finance Act. He permits other fees...permits any other fees that can be charged in a comparable...cash transaction. What this means is this effectively permits lenders to charge any fee they choose. It permits the lender to charge nonrefundable fees in connection with granting a real estate loan, such as, charging points on a loan. There are so many provisions of this bill that are wrong and should not pass that I have brought forth this

amendment to make some restoration particularly on the limitations which he has removed on the fines if you are found in violation. It seems to me that the...as I've been told, the Legal Assistance Foundation has some serious objections to this bill. By virtue of the adoption of Amendment No. 1, I assume that they would, in fact, withdraw their objections and, therefore, House Bill 1556 would simply be a bill that was suggested by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. I would move adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Demuzio has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1556. Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I appreciate Senator Demuzio's statements. This anticonsumer bill passed the House 108 to nothing, passed committee 7 to 1. Now, I...I do concede it is not without controversy but a 108 to...and, you know, the House makes some funny votes but a 108 to nothing, you know, you got to be realistic. Let me just raise a couple of the points, I could go every one, but there are a couple...first, the...we repealed the State Truth-in-Lending Law Act. That's true, but everybody has to live up to the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act which is tougher than the State one we're repealing. So, the point is that it's mandatory that they live up to the...to the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act. So, point number one, that's something to consider. We do away with the State Consumer Finance Act. Yes, that's true. We are combining the Consumer Finance Act and the Consumer Installment Loan Act. The department is supporting that, they have wanted to combine the two Acts before. Part of it is simply clarification. So, in once sense, yes, we're repealing it, but you have to remember, we're putting two of them into one thing. A...a few other points probably to

throw in; one, in terms of the fines that was mentioned, we offered to make the numbers higher. We've been negotiating for a week. Hey, I...you know, if...if...if the...one of those things was unreasonable, we offered to take an amendment. We offered to do that. Let me just throw in a couple more of the things that the amendment does, it...it won't let someone offer loss in income insurance. Well, if you're...and remember the guys who are making these loans are not living in Kenilworth making two hundred and fifty grand a year, this is the Joe Six-pack loan, and some of these guys occasionally get unemployed and they've got collateral up against these loans. The poor guy loses his job and without the ability of having some kind of loss of income insurance, not only does he lose the loan, not only does he lose what he was buying with it, but he loses his collateral. This idea distinctly benefits the borrower 'cause this kind of guy does occasionally lose his job and we're trying to protect him so he doesn't lose his collateral, the loan and whatever he was trying to buy. We're doing him a favor. You know, and that's something that I think is being missed. This also takes away their ability to give what would be a...a first mortgage loan on properties of three thousand to ten thousand. Hey, how many skilled tradesmen buy a piece of property up in Wisconsin near a lake? They know they can build their own place. So you need a couple of thousand bucks to buy empty property and given them four years, he'll build their own place. Hey, again, this is Joe Six-pack's summer home. It's not the Kenilworth summer home. So, those...I could go on and on on technical points within it. Part of it...in terms of taking away the ability to put notes into the secondary market. Being able to sell some of these homes in the secondary market brings down your interest rate. You're actually offering a way to make it easier for the guy to get what he

wants. I could run down item after item. I'd be more than happy to but I want to save the time of the Senate and say, it is my bill. I'd like it in this form on 3rd reading. I would appreciate your opposition to the amendment. I'll be happy to talk to any individual member and explain the exact points of it, and remember, this anticonsumer bill passed the House a 108 to nothing and the committee 7 to 1. I'd appreciate a No vote on this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. Any further discussion? Senator Demuzio, you wish to close?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, I do. There was a very similar bill, Senator Keats, that was in this General Assembly last Session. It was...rejected by the Senate Finance Committee two years ago, by the House of 3 to 7 to 1. Now, if you folks in here want to vote for a bill that's going to remove the State truth-in-lending provisions, if you're going to allow for the loan company to charge whatever they want in terms of...of fees, then you ought to go ahead and vote against this amendment. I suggest to you that this is, in fact, a good amendment, and I would move adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1556 and ask for a roll call.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1556. 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...take the record. On that question, there are 20 Ayes, 33 Nays, none voting Present. Amendment No. 1 fails. Are there further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 1814, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

We will probably, if we could, address this Monday. There is an amendment that is being drawn up...that staff is drawing up and then, of course, there are other interest groups who have their own amendments to be offered, and...and once we get that together, then I probably would suggest that we try and explain it to our respective caucuses and then let the...let the fur fly on the other...the OCC's. So, I...I just wanted to...alert the Chamber that there is an amendment that the joint committee staff has been working on, and I think that's what Senator Netsch was going to say, and then we can get it amended Monday and go through that process and send it off to the House.

PRESIDENT:

All right, with leave of the Body, that'll...1814 be deferred till Monday. 2179, Senator Topinka. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2179. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

House Bill 2179.

(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. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR PHILIP:

You know, it's late in the afternoon, I would suggest that we adjourn, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

That's...Senator Joyce, for what purpose do you arise? I thought that's what we wanted to do?

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Well, that's...that was before the...the...we got twenty-nine votes here, Phil...adjourn.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate...Senate Resolution 391 offered by Senator Marovitz, Carroll and Berman, congratulatory.

392, Senator Lemke, congratulatory.

393, Senator Lemke, congratulatory.

And 394, Senator Davidson and all Senators, and it's a death resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 78, by Senators Geo-Karis, Philip, Rock and others.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move to suspend the appropriate rules for the immediate consideration of this resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Joint Resolution 78, Senator Geo-Karis has moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of this resolution. All in favor of the motion to suspend indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Geo-Karis on Senate Joint Resolution 78.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate,

this Senate Joint Resolution 78 refers to the O'Hare Air Reserves Forces facility at O'Hare Airport, which is in Cook County at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center in Lake County, two installations that are vital militarily to the nation and vital economically to the State of Illinois. As we all know, at Great Lakes there's twenty-two thousand personnel...military...personnel, there's thirty-five hundred civilian employees, five thousand military...dependents, and we also, at O'Hare...O'Hare Reserve Airport has fourteen hundred full-time employees and twenty-five hundred reservists. I think it's vital to the betterment...to the...to the good of this State that we urge the members of Congress of the United State to defeat, and I repeat, to defeat proposed legislation aimed at closing the O'Hare Air Reserves...Forces facility at O'Hare Airport and at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center in Lake County. I might tell you that Illinois, which has approximately twelve million people, has about seven military installations, Texas that has about twenty-six million people has...rather, has twelve million people has twenty-six military installations. I think it's only right that we maintain what we have here and I ask that the Congress, with this resolution, act accordingly and I'd ask all of you to join me in this resolution, and I move the passage of this resolution.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Geo-Karis...

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

...all the members.

PRESIDENT:

...Senator Geo-Karis asks leave to show all members as cosponsor and...is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Geo-Karis moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 78. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senator Joyce, for what

purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Mr. President, an inquiry of the Chair. Is it the Chair's intention to proceed with a...a vote on the motion to adjourn or to proceed with House Bill 570 or where are we going at this point?

PRESIDENT:

The sponsor of 570 indicated to me that he...

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

It was my...it was my understanding that there are two sponsors on 570.

PRESIDENT:

Yeah, but custom and uses in tradition, the lead sponsor controls the destiny of...of a bill.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Inquiry of the Chair. Could...could you inform us when this bill will be heard then?

PRESIDENT:

Monday.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

At what time? Do you know?

PRESIDENT:

I...I...

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

...two? Ten?

PRESIDENT:

Well,...here's...as I view it, Monday will be...

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

It...it will not be the first order of business:

PRESIDENT:

It will not be the first order of business.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

On Monday we will have, I am sure, the Secretary informs me, some further requests for recalls. It will be the last opportunity for bills on 2nd reading to be moved and we will also handle 3rd reading and the Agreed Bill List on Monday. Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

So, if Senator Philip is lacking the votes on Monday, as he is lacking the votes today, we will still proceed?

PRESIDENT:

...yes.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Yes. Further business? Announcements? All right, we have only the Consent Calendar remaining. Mr. Secretary, have any objections been filed to the Resolutions Consent Calendar?

SECRETARY:

No objections have been filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

All right, in that event, Senator Demuzio moves that Senate Resolution 369, 370, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, Senate Resolution 383, 384, 385, Senate Joint Resolution 75, House Joint Resolution 75 and House Joint Resolution 76, Senate Resolutions 387, 88, 89 and 390 and Senate Resolutions 391, 392, 393, 394 be adopted. All in favor of the motion to adopt indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolutions are adopted. Further business? Further announcements? If not, Senator Vadalabene moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Monday, Monday at the hour of ten o'clock in the morning. Hope everyone has a happy weekend. Senate stands adjourned.