34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of nine having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer this morning by Reverend Rudolph Shoultz, Union Baptist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Reverend.

THE REVEREND RUDOLPH SHOULTZ:

(Prayer given by the Reverend Shoultz)

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Reading of the Journal, Madam Secretary. Senator Hall. SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, April 26th; Thursday, April 27th; Friday, April 28th; Monday, May the 1st; Tuesday, May 2nd; Wednesday, May 3rd; Thursday, May 4th; Friday, May 5th; Tuesday, May 9th; Wednesday, May 10th, Thursday, May 1lth, Friday, May12th, Monday, May 15th; Tuesday, May 16th; Wednesday, May 17th; Thursday, May 18th, and Monday, May 22nd, in the year 1989, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Hall. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. And it is so ordered. Messages from the House.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate to wit:

Those are House Bills 40, 69, 90, 120, 204, 224, 258, 507, 547, 616, 645, 725, 1047, 1066, 1157, 1175, 1256, 1328,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

-- 1339, 1406, 1409, 1472, 1507, 1627, 1686, 1688, 1988, 2010, 2020, 2025, -- 2039, 2040, 2304, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2346, 2348, 2421, 2435, 2451, 2463, 2574, 2576, 2700, 2780, 2790, 2816 passed the House May 22, 1989.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention, and those within the sound of my voice. As we indicated yesterday, we will begin on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, with those Members who have indicated they wish to recall bills for amendments. And then we will proceed, after that Order of business, to the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading as, obviously, we moved a lot of bills to 2nd Reading yesterday. We will the Members an opportunity to move those bills. We not be handling -- we will not be handling appropriation bills Those will be done first thing in the morning, at Senator Philip's request. So while the Members are getting their files together -I would ask the sponsors, Senators Brookins, Welch, O'Daniel, Smith, et al to get their files ready. In the meantime, Madam Secretary ... (machine cutoff) ... In the meantime, we will move with leave of the Body to the Order of House Bills 1st Reading, and I'd ask the Members to please get their files ready. As as that Order is finished, we'll go to Recalls. Page 54 on the Calendar. On the Order of House Bills 1st Reading, Madam Secretary. Read the bills please.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 103 offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 115 offered by Senator Rigney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 458 offered by Senator Woodyard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 490 offered by President Rock.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 522 offered by Senator Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 644 offered by Senator Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4 -- pardon me, 753 offered by Senator Rea.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 799 offered by Senator Karpiel.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 886 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 995 offered by Senator Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1051 offered by Senator Madigan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1085 offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1097 offered by Senator Rea.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1189 offered by Senator Severns.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1203 offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1225 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1244 offered by Senator Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1255 offered by Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1385 offered by Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1423 offered by Senator Zito.

### 34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1616 offered by Senator Watson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1671 offered by Senator Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2031 offered by Senator Schuneman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2314 offered by Senator Daley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2333 offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2345 offered by Senators Jacobs and Weaver.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2439 offered by Senator Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2482 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2485 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2487 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2599 offered by Senator Rea.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2665 offered by Senator Schaffer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2737 offered by Senator Davidson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills...(machine cutoff)...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rea, for what purpose do you arise, sir? SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point.

#### SENATOR REA:

I'd like to introduce the Ewing Northern School District, up in the President's Gallery.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will begin on the Order of Recalls. I understand everyone has a list of those bills that Members have indicated they wish to Recall for purposes of an amendment, so I'd ask you just to --. All right. We'll move to Page 19 on the Calendar. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 6. Senator Brookins seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 6, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Brookins.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Brookins, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR BROOKINS:

Yes, Mr. President. Amendment No. -- No. 2 removes all language in the bill which speaks of same day registration, and I move for the passage of Amendment No. 2.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Brookins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 6. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 38. Senator Welch. Bottom of Page 19. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 38. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 38, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch, on Amendment No. 1.

### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What amendment No. 1 will do to this bill is, basically, delete the original contents of the bill. It creates the same program, only uses different mechanisms. What it creates, is an Act to promote Energy Efficiency and to reduce operating costs in governmental buildings. The purpose of the amendment is that there was a number of objections, due to the fact that the original bill created a new agency in government. What have decided to do by this amendment, instead, is to let the program be administered by Department of Energy and Natural Resources - have a council consisting of -- an Interstate Energy Conservation Committee composed of the directors of ENR, CDB and CMS, to be staffed by Energy and Natural Resources. I'd be glad to answer any questions at this time.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 38. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 20. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 41. Senator O'Daniel seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 41, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator O'Daniel.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. What amendment No. 2 does - it adds that reimbursement to counties, for each person committed to the county jail, should not be made for any time served in pre-trial detention. This was a concern that Senator Hawkinson had, and I think this addresses that issue. I'd move for its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 41. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 20 is Senate Bill 48. Senator Smith seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 48, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 48 offered by Senator Smith.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. -- President. I -- I move to Table the committee's amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Smith, having voted on the prevailing side, has moved to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 48. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Smith.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith, on Amendment No. 2.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is identical to contents to the committee's amendment, except this Floor amendment corrects the LRB's drafting error in the committee's amendment. I move for the adoption.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Smith's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 48. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 20 is Senate Bill 57. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 57, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Welch.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What Amendment No. 2 will do is two things. Number one, it deletes the original bill's tax applicability to hazard waste. Secondly, it changes the incidence of the tax, which was going to apply to — going to a landfill which isn't your nearest landfill. What this bill does — is say that the tax will apply to waste transport in more than twenty-five miles between the point of generation, and the point of disposal. I would move for adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of -- of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 57. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 90. Senator Lechowicz. 126. Senator Hawkinson seeks leave of the Body - Ladies and Gentlemen we're now at the bottom of Page 21. Senate Bill 126. Senator Hawkinson seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 126, Madam Secretary. All right. Senator Hawkinson.

### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. First, I'd like --

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Pardon me. I think the wrong description is up there. Senator Hawkinson.

### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. First, I'd like leave of the Body to Table Senate Amendment No. 1, which was adopted erroneously last week.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Hawkinson, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 126 was adopted. All in favor of the motion to reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Hawkinson now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 126. Discussion? All in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is Tabled. Amendment — further amendments, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Hawkinson.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hawkinson, on Amendment No. 2.

# SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the amendment which we intended to adopt last week, which was sought by various womens' groups, to the Pre-sentence Report Bill. It would require that certain information be included in the pre-sentence report in cases involving sexual abuse, or family matter offenses. I would urge its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Hawkinson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 126. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

The amendment's adopted. Further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Hawkinson.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hawkinson, on Amendment No. 3.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've cleared this amendment with Democratic staff in the Judiciary Committee, and with -- with the Chairman. It does two things. The first part -- exempts Cook County, but for the rest of the State, allows the chief judge of a circuit to assign another judge - to hear applications for an eavesdropping device. The second -- the second part of the bill allows -- it talks about the standard of proof, to be adopted and used by the courts for motions in arrest of judgment attacking the indictment, or the information, or complaint and makes that standard the same standard used on appellate review. And I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Hawkinson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 126. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 21. 131. Senator Geo-Karis seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 131, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis, on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which the -- prior amendment was put on the Senate Floor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Which?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

No. 2.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Geo-Karis, having voted on the prevailing side, is moving to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 131 was adopted. All in favor of the motion to reconsider indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Senator Geo-Karis now moves to Table Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 131. All in favor of the motion to Table indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. Amendment No. 2 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 3 is an amendment that was worked on by the Chicago Bar Association and our staff, which is acceptable to both. And I would like to move for its passage.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 131. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 22. Senator Maitland has Senate Bill 187, and seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading -- 2nd Reading -- is Senate Bill 187, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Schuneman.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman, on -- Amendment No. 2.

### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment provides that June 30th of the year preceding an annexation of a school district, shall be the cutoff date for determining any deficits which would trigger supplemental State aid, pertaining to that annexation. I would move adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 187. Discussion? Senator Demuzio. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I'm sorry, but the -- the paper is flying around here so -- so fast. Has this -- Senator, has this amendment been distributed -- and the next one?

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, it was filed yesterday, Senator. Maybe I could clear up some of your questions. Senator, one -- is it okay?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

All right. Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 187. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Maitland.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Maitland, on Amendment No. 3. Maitland, please. SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This permits -- voluntary dissolution of -- of a school district. What we are saying here, is that if a school district chooses not to continue to exist, they simply, by board action, can decide to dissolve a district, and -- and seek to -- to go to another district. -- The county board of school trustees would make that decision for them.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 187. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 23 is Senate Bill 213. Senator Netsch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? On the Order of -- leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 213, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch. PRESIDENT ROCK:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Netsch, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

First of all, if I might, Mr. President, Amendment No. 1 was incorrect. It was in the incorrect form. So, having voted on the prevailing side, I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted. And then I would move to Table Amendment No. 1.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Netsch, having voted on the prevailing side, is moving to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to Senate 213 was adopted. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote is reconsidered. Senator Netsch now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 213. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch, on Amendment No. 2.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 is identical to Amendment No. 1, except it contains a correct reference to the Private Activity Bond Allocation Council, rather than to the Governor's Office. This is the amendment that also reflects Senator Topinka's proposal that, I believe, is not actively before us right now. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2-1-3.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Netsch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 213. Discussion? If not, all in favor,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 248. Senator Zito. 361. Senator Jones. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of Page 24, Senate Bill 361. Senator Jones seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 361, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones, on Amendment No. 2.

### SENATOR JONES:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the -- of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 allows a State employee to purchase -- pension credit for service as a full-time employee with a Regional Planning Commission. Allows downstate teachers to purchase credit up to two years for military service, and it exempts the State from reimbursement to local governments under the State Mandate Act, and I move its adoption

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Jones has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 361. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 25. Senate Bill 477. Senator

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

O'Daniel seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 477, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator O'Daniel.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 does, in cases where an evaluation instrument is in dispute, the State Board of Education shall postpone its evaluation until the dispute is resolved. I'd move for its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 477. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of page 27. Senator Luft. 529. Senator Luft seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 529, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Luft and...DeAngelis.

### PRESIDING OFFICER:

Senator Luft.

#### SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment...there were errors

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

in drafting and they're technical in nature. It's misspelled words, and I'd move for the adoption of the amendment.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 529. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 27. 588. Senator Netsch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 588, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch, on Amendment No. 2.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe that all of the provisions of Amendment No. 2 are technical, with one exception, and that is the -- deals with the provision that requires a tax search before recording of ownership transfers. This is, by the way, the bill that deals with a tax delinquencies and scavenger sales. At the request of a number of the downstate folks, we have restricted the requirement for tax search to Cook County. They felt that they had not nearly as much problem with this issue as Cook County, and that it would be real difficulty for some of the downstate areas. So, the required seven year tax search is restricted to Cook County by this amendment. I would the adoption of Amendment No. 2, I believe.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 588. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 27. Senator Mahar seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 591, Madam Secretary. (Machine cutoff)...

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Mahar.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Mahar.

#### SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment prohibits alcohol sales to drivers and passengers from drive-up windows.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Mahar has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 591. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 28, Senator Holmberg seeks leave of the Body to return Senate 592 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 592, Madam

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Holmberg.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg, on Amendment No. 1.

### SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill was suggested -- this amendment was suggested in committee. We're talking, here, about membership on the boards of the education service centers, serving Class 1 and Class 2 County School Units. And they have an eleven member board right now, consisting of teachers, superintendents, regional superintendents, school board members, representative of institution of higher learning. Originally it was asked that teachers provide half, or more, of the members on that board. The committee suggested that we lower it. It is now five, which is less than half, that shall be public school teachers nominated by the local bargaining representatives. And this way they will have, at least, assured input into the service center that deals directly with them.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 592. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 28, Senator Collins seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 613 to Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 613, Madam Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Collins.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

First, I would like to - Mr. President to Table the committee amendment.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Collins, having voted on the prevailing side, has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 613 was adopted. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Collins now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 613. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments? Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Collins.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 2

# SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 deletes everything after the enacting clause, and we Tabled No. -- committee amendment, so that the bill could track better. What the amendment does - and -- and let me just say that we've worked on this legislation for a long period of time with the Department of Children and Family Services, Department of -- of Public Health, and -- and DASA, and some of the community groups; trying to strike some kind of accommodation in relation to how we are going to address the problems of addicted pregnant mothers, to -- to -- to, hopefully, minimize the risk of those

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

children being born addicted to drugs. And -- and what we -- we came up with - the Department of Children and Family Services suggested an amendment and I -- I understand that this amendment is also on several other bills that -- we extend the definition of abused child to include the new born infants, who are physically dependent upon an illegal substance. Because the Department needed to, at that point in time, be able to come in and -- in many instances, take custody of those children, who were left in the hospitals, or that was addicted to substance abuse upon birth. It also requires the hospitals to -- to screen those high-risk mothers, or if they suspect that once a child -- a mother's given birth in a hospital that that mother is addicted to substance abuse, to, in fact, to screen those children prior to the children leaving the hospitals, to determine whether or not the child had any negative impact from the mother's addiction, and to report the findings of those children to the Department of Children Family Services. In addition, it also required that those doctors, who had pre-screened, and found women to be pregnant addicted, to report to the State Board of Health the find -- their findings, and in turn, the State Board of Health would contact the local Infant Mortality -- Reduction Network within the area which the mother lived, to inform them to get involved with that person - to encourage them to get involved with recovery programs, and treatment programs, to minimize the possibility that that child would be born addicted. I move the adoption of the amendment. I would be happy to answer any questions.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Collins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 613. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Collins.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 3.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. This amendment amends the bill to -- require that the Department of Public Health expand it's Infant Mortality Programs through its provider agencies, to develop special case finding and service coordination for addicted mothers, and I would move for its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 613. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 28. Senator Berman seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 628 to the Order of 2nd Reading. 6-2-8, for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 628, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Berman.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman, on Amendment No. 1.

### SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a technical amendment from LRB. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 628. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 29 is Senate Bill 635, and Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 635, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this amendment to Senate Bill 635 will do, is require a five dollar returnable fee or credit, if returned, on all lead acid batteries. It will require the retailers and wholesalers to accept used batteries. I would move for adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 635. Discussion. If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 29, 636. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 636, Madam

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. This bill -- this amendment will amend the Solid Waste Planning Act concerning an official recycling emblem. Instead of directing the Department of ENR to establish an official State Recycling Emblem immediately, what this amendment will do - is to require that if a National Emblem is not recognized by January 1 of 1992, then ENR is to conduct a consumer awareness program concerning recycling. I would move for adoption of the amendment.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 636. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 638. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 638, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

This amendment will amend the Solid Waste Planning and

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Recycling -- Act, to allow for municipalities to combine to create recycling programs and be -- able to receive grants. I would move for adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 638. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 31, Senator Smith seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 701 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 701, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 filed by Senator Smith.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith, on Amendment No. 1.

#### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment clarifies the intent of the bill. The geriatrics course requirement is limited to applicants whose practice is, or will be, in the area of geriatrics; or applicants who are, or who will be, practicing in the field where a knowledge of geriatrics will be appropriated. I move for the adoption of this amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 701. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 32. 716. Senator Netsch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill from the Order of 3rd Reading, to the Order of 2nd, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 716, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch.

### SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, Amendment No. 1 was technically incorrect. It did not include all the references, so, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch, having voted on the prevailing side, is moving to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 716 was adopted. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Netsch now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 716. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 achieves the same purpose, which is to add plate making to the photo processing procedures to which the photo processing tax will not apply. This is a clarification of the intent of the sales tax reform cleanup. The corrected amendment, however, picks up a number of other references to the same point. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 716.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 716. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 33. Senator Holmberg. Senator Holmberg. Going once. Senator Holmberg, going twice. Senator Holmberg, going three times. 746. Senator Dunn. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 746. Senator Dunn seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 746, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Thomas Dunn.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn.

### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. These are purely technical. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 746. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 7-7-2. Senator Marovitz. 774. Senator Schuneman. Middle of Page 34. Senate Bill 774. Senator Schuneman seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 7-7-4, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Schuneman.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a technical amendment suggested by Senate Enrolling and Engrossing. Simply changes the word "and" to "any." Move adoption.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 774. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 33. We'll go back to 732, Madam Secretary. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 732. Senator Holmberg seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading. On the Order -- Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 732, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Holmberg.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment meets some objections raised in committee and provides this change, that will require any firefighter who wants to resume lapsed coverage, to meet any exclusions in the policy on preexisting medical conditions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 732. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 900. Senator O'Daniel. Middle of Page 37. Senator O'Daniel seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 900 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 900. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator O'Daniel.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 allows the brewer the first right to purchase a salvageable product from the wholesaler at a price not to exceed the original cost of the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

product or subsequently, re-purchase the product from the insurance company or salvage company. I'd move for its adoption. PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator O'Daniel's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 900. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 36. 878. Senator Marovitz has joined us. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 878. Senator Marovitz seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 878, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

We're on 2nd Reading, please. Senator Marovitz.
SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 878 allows the court to order medical insurance coverage for a child. Not only when the first-establishing the child support obligation, but also when enforcing, or modifying a previously established child support order. It also provides two additional remedies for noncompliance with a medical support-order making the noncustodial parent liable for reasonable portion of medical expenses actually incurred, and allowing noncompliance to be the basis for a modification of the underlying order of support.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 878. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of page 37. 901. Senator Luft seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 901, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR LUFT:

I'd ask leave to withdraw Amendment No. 2, please.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 clarifies that the ownership level for purchase and assumption agreements shall be fifty percent or more, and not fifty-one percent. The limitations imposed on the relocation of main banks shall not apply to banks which have transfers...transferred substantially all of its assets and liabilities prior to the effective date of this act provided the bank has been relocated on or before 7/1/1991.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 901. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 40 is Senate Bill 9-9-9. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 999.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this amendment will do, is make this bill identical to House Bill 1414, which was amended, and is now over here in the Senate. It deletes the mandate that DCFS assist child care centers and family day care homes with certain activities, requiring DCCA to carry out the foregoing mandate, subject to appropriations by the General Assembly. I'd move for adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 9-9-9. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 41. Senator Rigney seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1038 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1038, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Rigney.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rigney, on Amendment No. 3.

#### SENATOR RIGNEY:

Mr. President, first of all we will need to Table Amendment
No. 2. It's technically incorrect.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Rigney, having voted on the prevailing side, is moving to Table -- to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was adopted, for the purpose of Tabling. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Rigney now moves to Table Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1038. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is Tabled. Madam Secretary, further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Rigney.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rigney, on Amendment No. 3.

#### SENATOR RIGNEY:

Mr. President, this is the same as Amendment No. 2, but is technically correct.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rigney's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1038. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 41. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body -- 1044, seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1044, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Welch.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment replaces many of the requirements in the original bill. What it does now, is to establish a section of toxic pollution prevention within the Environmental Protection Agency - creates a Toxic Pollution Prevention Program, and a Toxic Pollution Prevention Fund. I'd move for adoption of the amendment.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1044. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1153. Senator Welch. Bottom of Page 44. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return 1153 to the Order

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted?

Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is

Senate Bill 1153, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch, on Amendment No. 1.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This changes the Computer Virus -Law to a -- violation within the existing Statue, instead of
creating a new violation. What it does, is it eliminates the
offense of an aggravated computer virus insertion, and eliminates
the term computer virus insertion as well. I would move for
adoption of the amendment.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1153. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Middle of Page 46. Senator Marovitz seeks leave of the Body to return 1217 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1217, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Marovitz.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz, on Amendment No. 3.

#### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Having voted on the prevailing side, on the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was adopted,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

I would move to Table Amendment 2 for the purpose of -- to reconsider, for the purposes of Tabling.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Marovitz, having voted on the prevailing side, is moving to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1217 was adopted. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Marovitz now moves to Table Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1217. All in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Marovitz.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 is the same as Amendment No. 2, only one word was left out - the word "assets." It does protect the pension funds of the existing company from the raiding company, and I would ask for its adoption.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1217. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 49. Senator Dunn - 1310 - seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1310, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Thomas Dunn.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn.

#### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. These are technical amendments recommended by Enrolling and Engrossing. I urge adoption.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1310. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1378. Senator D'Arco seeks leave of the Body to return 1378 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Middle of Page 51. Is leave granted? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1378, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator D'Arco.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator D'Arco.

#### SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 deletes the statutory requirement to have six hundred hours of training in an approved school of -- electrology, and now provides that the Department shall establish, by rule, the amount of hours. It also clarifies the practice that the electrolysis will not have to go back to school to take an exam if they're already practicing, so

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

long as they have practiced for three of the last five years. I'm sorry. They have to take an exam, but so long as they've have been practicing for the last three of five years. Move to adopt Amendment No. 2.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator D'Arco's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1378. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1388. Senator Welch seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1388, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Welch.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

# SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this amendment does - is codifies Title III οf the Superfund Amendments and Re-authorization Act of 1986 into State Law. What it will do, is allow the Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency, acting as the State Emergency Response Commission, more discretion and control over emergency actions, within the State of Illinois. This will result in the State of Illinois receiving money that currently goes to the federal government; because they are now in control of this title of the Superfund Act. This will put Illinois in control, and allow them to receive the funds. I would move for adoption of this amendment.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1388. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Senator Brookins. 1412. Bottom of Page 52. Senator Brookins seeks leave of the Body to return 1412 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1412. Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Brookins.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Brookins, on Amendment No. 1.

# SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 provides methods by which physicians and DCFS must seek evaluation and treatment for substance abuse for women suspected of using controlled substance in the third trimester -- of pregnancy.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Brookins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1412. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1420. Senator O'Daniel seeks leave of the Body, top of Page 53, to return 1420 to the Order of 2nd Reading, for

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1420, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator O'Daniel.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel, on Amendment No. 1.

## SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment removes commercial buildings from the legislation, and I would move for its adoption. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel has moved the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1420. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1431. Senator Collins seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1431, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Collins.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 2.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

First, Mr. President. Having voted on the prevailing side, I would like -- I would move, at this time, to Table Committee Amendment No. 1.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, having voted on the prevailing side, is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

moving it to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1431 was adopted. All in favor of the Motion to Reconsider, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote's reconsidered. Senator Collins now moves to Table Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1431. Discussion? If not, all in favor of the Motion to Table, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further amendments, Madam Secretary?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Collins.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 2.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 becomes the bill. This is a bill that we've been working for about six months now with the Department of Corrections, and some of the other provider agencies, on trying to deal with some of the real problems, and the cost of -- of prison overcrowdedness. And the Department now is neutral on this particular amendment, although they support all of the amendment, with the exception of one provision that we changed from "may" to "shall," because we believe firmly that if, in fact, the inmates work, that they should have the responsibility for paying a part of the monies that they earn for their -- for the upkeep of the cost of incarceration. So, that is now the -- the -- bone of contention between the Department and myself. And I feel that that should stay in the bill, so I move for its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1431. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll go back and pick up Senate Bill 59. Senator Zito. Middle of Page 20, is Senate Bill 59. Senator Zito seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 59, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Zito.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Zito, on Amendment No. 1.

#### SENATOR ZITO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members. Amendment No. 1 was suggested by the Revenue Committee. It simply eliminates exemption from the State's Mandates Act, and I move for its adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Zito moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 59. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 21 is Senate Bill 90. Senator Lechowicz seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 90, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Lechowicz.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Lechowicz, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 would make sure that the bill would comply with the federal language, so that the RTA, CTA, or Metro would not lose any federal funds, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 90. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Top of Page 23. Senator Zito. 248. Senator Zito seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an Amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 248, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. Amendment No. 1 changes one word, on Page 3, line 22, by changing the word "speed" to "flow," and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Zito's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 248. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 7-7-2. Senator Marovitz. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 772. Senate Marovitz seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading, for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 7-7-2. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment offers quick-take provisions for home rule communities. Those -- quick-take provisions only apply in enterprise zones. There has to be a majority vote of the city council granting that provision, and it has to be specifically for economic development or infrastructure. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 772. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. ...(machine cutoff)... Ladies and Gentlemen we'll begin now -- that concludes the Recall List. We'll begin now on Page 2 on the Calendar. And, again, I would ask for your

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

attention. So that we can move with some speed through 2nd Reading. We will -- we will not consider the appropriation bills today, at Senator Philip's request, we'll do those in the morning. So I'd ask the Members to pay attention, and let's move as quickly as possible. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 3. Senator Welch. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 10. Senator Welch. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 10. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 10.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 11. Senator Jones. Senator Jones. Senate Bill 22. Senator Netsch. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 22. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 22.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 39. Senator Welch. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 39. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 39.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any -- any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 69. Senator D'Arco. On the -- all right. 77. Senator Dudycz. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 77, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 77.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Dudycz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

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

Amendment -- Floor Amendment No. 1 is technical in nature. It changes the year in which the license plates would be available from 1990, to registration year 1991. It also makes two technical changes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 77. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 83, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 83.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 93. Senator Smith. On the Order of Senate Bills -- Senator Smith. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 93, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 93.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, my Calendar indicates -- all right. 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 96. Senator Jones. Senator Jones. Top of Page 3, 97, 128. Senator. 160. Senator Luft. All right. Senator -- well, we don't necessarily -- we don't -- we don't do that -- Senate Bill 160, Madam Secretary. No. 201. Senator Watson. 201's a fiscal note. 210. Senator Geo-Karis. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 210, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 210.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

-- Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, my Calendar indicates there's a Floor amendment that -- all right. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. 3rd Reading. 211. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 211, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 211.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senators Jacobs and Geo-Karis offer Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Jacobs-Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment strictly allows for a vote to be taken, or a resolution to made by the county board of the county in which land, or any part, is located. And a consent must be passed by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds the total number of members entitled to sit on the county board, in order to allow for acquiring of land in unincorporated areas of the county, by condemnation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 211. Is there discussion. If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 223. Senator DeAngelis. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 223, Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 223.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 227. Senator Friedland on the Floor? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 227, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 227.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Friedland -- pardon me, Senator DeAngelis offers
Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. There is occurring, in a lot of the unincorporated township areas, a situation which is similar to urban growth. And what Amendment No. 1 simply does - it gives the county the same authority in setting speed limits as currently is given to park districts, villages, and towns. I would urge the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? Senator Friedland.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

You bet, Mr. President. Thank you very much. I understand

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

what the sponsor's trying to do, but local officials don't want this amendment. So, I'd urge you to reject it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, may close.

## SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I don't know what local official he's talking about. There is -- there is some disagreement for one reason, and that is that they don't want the responsibility. However, they don't want to ask for the responsibility, because then you become liable. What they would like for us to do is give them the responsibility. I don't know - there isn't any other way of dealing with this problem, and there are areas -- there are areas that --

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Friedland. Wait a minute, Senator Friedland the Gentleman was closing. For what purpose do you arise? Senator Friedland.

#### SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

No, I'm going to tell him another way to deal with the problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, the Gentleman was closing.

## SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Oh. No. I'm sorry, go ahead and let him close.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

# SENATOR DeANGELIS:

With all due respect to Senator Friedland, this is his bill. He ought to be allowed to -- to continue if there's any stronger objection than what he's already voiced.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. I 'll -- I'll come back. Senator DeAngelis. Senator Friedland. ... (machine cutoff)...

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Are you done? To make things brief, I mean, the leader should just introduce his own bill next Session. You know. You know what I mean.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, do you wish to close? We're going to move on here. Senator DeAngelis has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 227. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it. The -- Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 233. Senator Etheredge. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 233, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments. ... (machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 234. Senator Mahar. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of Page 3, Senate Bill 234, Madam Secretary. Read that bill, please.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 234.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Mahar offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. There's two parts to this amendment. The first is a technical change. The second exempts the sale of pitchers of beer from the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 234. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 238. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 238, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 238.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 4. 239. Senator Barkhausen. On the Order

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 239, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 239.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 240. Senator Watson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please. 2-4-0.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 240.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 242. Senator Joyce, J. E. 253. Senator Raica. Senator Raica. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 253, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 253.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 258. Senator Schaffer. Senator Schaffer on the Floor? 265. 266. Senator Marovitz. 269. Senator DeAngelis. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 269, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 269.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 275. Senator Smith. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 275, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 275.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Smith offers Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill -- the amendment to Senate Bill 275 is -- that I -- will tend to cut the appropriation, from thirty percent, to ten percent. I will restrict it to - merely - to the -- it

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

will be restricted to the work place and the -- to the child care facility where -- inserting the dependent care on the assistance program. In other words, we're cutting the budget down, in order that it will comply. That's what it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 275. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Before we leave that page, Senator Schaffer on 258. On the Order of - Senate Bill 2-5-8-. Madam Secretary, read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 265. Senator Schaffer. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 265. We'll take that up too.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 265.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Schaffer offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. And I understand it just corrects a spelling error.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to -House -- to Senate Bill 265. 265. Is there discussion? If not,
those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The
Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?
SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 5. 283. Senator Etheredge. 287. 289. Senator Marovitz. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, middle of Page 5, Senate Bill 2-8-9, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

Senate Bill 289.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 290. Senator Marovitz. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 290, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 290.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 296. Senator Kustra. Senator Kustra on the Floor? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 296, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 296.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 306. Senator Jones. 321. Senator Keats. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of Page 5, Senate Bill 321, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 321.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Keats offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

This was the amendment suggested by Judge Hamilton, the Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court in Cook County, that he said — with this, his people were in favor of the bill,2800 and that's all I'm adding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Keats has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2 -- I'm sorry, to 321. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

(Machine cutoff)...6. 344. Senator Dunn. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, top of Page 6, is Senate Bill 344, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 344.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Ralph Dunn offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Ralph Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment limits the new games on bingo to one community in my district. And I'd urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 344. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 269 has a fiscal note. Page -- Senator Etheredge, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

The fiscal note has been filed. ... (machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Madam Secretary, has a fiscal note been filed? Senator Etheredge, we don't have it. Page 8, ...(inaudible)... 451, Senator DeAngelis. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 451. Well, that's a fiscal note on that one, too. I beg your pardon. All right. Senator Etheredge is (machine cutoff) All right. Senator DeAngelis, on 451. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 451, Madam Secretary. (machine cutoff)...Senator DeAngelis, we don't have a fiscal note filed with this one, either. So take it out of the record. Page 9. 455. Senator Davidson. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 455, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 455.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 458. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 4-5-8, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 458.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Davidson offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

#### SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This amendment is from the Guardianship Commission. And what it does, on Page 1, the age of the person is not to be the sole criteria for determining disability. Also, on Page 1, it provides for clear and convincing evidence that the person is disabled. Right now it's -- preponderance of evidence, which is too loose. Number 3: to be a guardian, a person has to have a background training, or experience, that shows that he, or she, has knowledge - legal - economical -- psychosocial needs of the disabled person. On Page 3; guardian, ad litem, or representative of the court is to give the person a clear and understanding description of the hearing procedures. On Page 5; written statements given to the ward are

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

to be easily read and understood. This amends out that big long statement that was in the original bill. Move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 458. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 474. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 474, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 474.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. -- 475. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 475, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 475.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No Floor amendments.

## PRESIDING OFFICER:

3rd Reading. 482. Senator Jones. 488. Senator Schuneman. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 488, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 488.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 491. Senator Maitland. 491. Senator Maitland on the Floor? 494. Senator Holmberg. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 494, Madam Secretary. Read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 494.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg.

# SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. With -- with leave of the Body, I would like permission to Table the committee amendment.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Holmberg (machine cutoff)... All right. Having voted -- no (machine cutoff)...Senator -- Senator Holmberg moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 494. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor, indicate by saying Aye.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Holmberg offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg.

#### SENATOR HOLMBERG:

This amendment Tables that -- incorporates that technical amendment just Tabled, and adds this language. This is connected with the TIF groups, that so many of us have in our -- our local community. It was a bill originally brought to me by ED-RED. And basically, as amended, at the suggestion of the committee, it makes the establishment of a joint review board for a TIF organization strictly permissive. The board's recommendation is advisory, and non-binding. And, basically, this satisfies the committee's request, and makes the board advisory. It's - the amendment is agreed to by ED-RED and the TIF Association, the major proponent and opponent of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Holmberg has moved the adoption of Amendment No. -- Amendment No. 2. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2's adopted. Further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

... Further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 500. Senator Vadalabene. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 5-0-0, Madam Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 500.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene.

## SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Having voted on the prevailing side, I would like to Table Committee No. 1 -- bill or Amendment No. 1 that was offered in committee.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene has moved to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 500. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Further committee amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Amendments from the Floor?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Vadalabene offers Amendment. No. 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene.

#### SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 -- this amendment removes the language that could have permitted the new library district tax rate to exceed the maximum tax rate last levied by the municipalities, on behalf of the Municipal Library. With this amendment, the bill no longer contains a tax increase.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

And I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 500. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 505. Senator Marovitz. 531. Senator Barkhausen. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 531, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 531.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 536. Senator Maitland - has a fiscal note. Page 10. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 533, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 533.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 10. 537. Senator Etheredge. Fiscal note. 543. Senator Brookins. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading (machine cutoff)... well, Senator Brookins, it has a judicial note request. Senator Rock.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

No. I -- I was going to ask the Gentleman if he'd hold it until the end. I have an amendment in the works, and I wanted the opportunity to discuss the amendment with the sponsor, and with the other side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is Senator -- take it out of the record. Now, there has been a number of people circling around here. You know, if you sit in you seat, when these things are called, we'll roll right through them. It's very confusing for the clerk down here, with all this paperwork shuffling around. So we're going to move right on. We're not going back. 557. Senator Philip. It's a fiscal note. 557. All right. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 5-5-7, Madam Secretary. Senate Bill 557.

Senate Bill 557.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Philip offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Per Senator D'Arco's suggestion, we've taken out stun

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

guns and taser guns. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 5-5-7.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 -- Senate Bill 557. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 5-5-9. Senator Philip. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 559, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 559.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any Amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Wait a minute. (machine cutoff)...On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 564, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 564.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Demuzio.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, Senator Dunn will handle that. Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment -- let me quote it, "provided, however, that if the rules of a national political party conflict with such requirements for filing petitions for nomination for delegates or alternate delegates to a national nominating convention, the chairman of the State central committee of such national political party shall notify the Board in writing, citing by reference the rules of the national political party in conflict, and in such case the Board shall direct such petitions to be filed not more than sixty-nine and not less that sixty-two days prior to the date of the primary."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Dunn has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

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

I would concur with the amendment. I think that the -- your national party ought to look at their rules, quite frankly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Dunn has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 564. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 572. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate BIll 572, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 572.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you. I'd like to Table Committee No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 572. Discussion? Those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted -- is Tabled. Further Committee Amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Jacobs offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 becomes the bill, and just strictly changes the bet limits and restricts location of rivers where a riverboat excursion gambling boat can be licensed. Ask for approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Jacobs has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2, Senate Bill 572. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 575, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 575.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 579. Senator Kustra. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 579, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 579.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Kustra offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment was suggested by the State Police. It corrects the problem whereby the new proposed standard of .08 would not conflict with the standard by which an individual was convicted of a previous DUI offense under the current .10 alcohol concentration level. I move for its adoption.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? If not, Senator Kustra moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 579. Those -- those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading, in the middle of Page, Senate Bill 583, Senator Kustra. Read the bill please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 583.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Kustra offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the amendment, I didn't even realize it was filed already; I thought we were going to do it on Recall. This is the amendment which explains just what is prohibited at the sale of gasoline stations and what isn't. Its an amendment that has been worked out by the Beer Distributors, the Petroleum Marketers, and the Illinois Alcoholism and Drug ~- Dependence Association. It brings everybody on board the bill. And I would move for its consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Kustra moves the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 583. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 587. Senator Schuneman. Senator Schuneman. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 587.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill -- 5-9-0, Senator Mahar. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 590.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Mahar offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. There's three parts to

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Floor Amendment No. 1. The first part attempts to further limit the scope of testing that is involved in this legislation. The second allows DASA to have supervisory responsibility. And the third part removes fines of -- employees who are found to have been tested positive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? If not, Senator Mahar moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 590. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading, at the bottom of Page 10 is Senate Bill 596. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary,

SECRETARY HAWKER:

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 596

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Raica. Oh, I'm sorry. Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 597. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 597.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading at the bottom of Page - is Senate Bill 601. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 601.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Barkhausen offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members. This is the agreed amendment limiting the application of the bill to counties of population over four hundred thousand, and under six hundred thousand. And I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? If not, Senator Barkhausen moves for the adoption of No. 1 to Senate Bill 6-0-1. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. At the bottom of Page - Senate Bill 603. On the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Barkhausen. Senator Barkhausen.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

603. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

.......

Senate Bill 603.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. At the top of page, on Page 11, on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 615. Senator Collins. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Collins, on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Having voted on the prevailing side, I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which Committee Amendment No. 1 was adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Collins, having moved -- voted on the prevailing side, moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. ... (machine cutoff)... Moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. The opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is Tabled. Were there any further committee amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Collins offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Collins, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you. Amendment No. 2 makes the application of the bill only to the Chicago Schools. It establish a due process procedure, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Collins moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 615. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 616. Senator Collins. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. (machine cutoff) We're trying to find the status of a fiscal note. (machine cutoff) All right. We'll take that bill out of the record. And we'll move on to the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 630. Senator Welch. On the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Welch. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 630.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee -- Pardon me, pardon me, the Committee on Energy and Environment offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, I would move to Table Committee Amendment No.
1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. Senator Welch, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to Table Amendment No. 1. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The amendment is Tabled. Any further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Dudycz offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dudycz, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 2 -- since Senate Bill 630 imposes a tax on most plastic containers, my amendment says that such State tax pre-empt local governments, including home rule units, from imposing a similar tax. Now the rationale for that -- for the amendment, is that currently Chicago -- the City of Chicago is considering a similar tax, and we do not wish the businesses and the people of Chicago to be taxed twice for the same thing - to take a double hit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, I have another amendment I'm offering to this bill that removes that tax, so it would render this bill -- you're

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

amendment, I think, and mine would not be in order. What my next amendment will do - is this, let me explain that. What my amendment will do is give a leeway of three years, allowing for the plastic industry to hit a target - a fifteen percent recycling target of all plastic containers by October 1, 1992. At that point, there would be a tax of one-cent per container. In 1994, if they don't hit twenty-five percent, there would be a two-cent tax per container. Now I -- the original bill, that you're amending, imposed a tax immediately, I believe, of five-cents per container. So what I'm doing is, I'm delaying the implementation of the tax until 1992. So I think that -- that throws your amendment out of whack with the rest of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Could you hold the bill then, so we can discuss this, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. That bill will be taken out of the record. We'll move, on the Order of 2nd Reading, to Senate Bill 633. Senator Welch. Read the bill please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 633.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 661. Senator Jeremiah Joyce. Out of the record. In the middle of the Page - 11, on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 671. Senator

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thomas Dunn. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Thomas Dunn offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

These amendments come at the Thank you, Mr. President. request of the Press Association, that objected, and other and there substantial changes in the bill. This amendment requires municipalities to approve the appointment of a non-resident as a deputy clerk. Secondly, it would delete and change - allowing the annual municipal accounts to be published in a pamphlet form, that would be taken out. It provides that the president or the mayor may appoint one of their members to act as the president or mayor in anticipation of such -- of a temporary absence or disability. Fourth, it would provide that the -- if an elected office becomes vacant, if the person so elected fails to take the oath of office, or post the required bond later than the time provided by law. And lastly, it would restore the provision that the bond requirement of all municipal officers need not extend to any loss sustained by insolvency, failure, or closing of any financial institution, if the institution has been approved by the corporate authorities as a depository.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Dunn moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 671. All those in

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendment? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 672. Senator Thomas Dunn. Out of the record. On the Order of 2nd Reading, in the middle of Page 11, is Senate Bill 674. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 674.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Raica offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

I'm sorry, Mr. President. Can you take it out of the record, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Okay. At the sponsor's request, that'll be removed from the record. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 676. Senator Topinka. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Topinka offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment would change the composition of the Civic Center Board, so that those persons serving as president and members of the Village Board would also serve as the Civic Center Board Members. And it would also make their terms coinciding with one another. And it adds some other new language to reflect the newspaper situation of when they would have to publish things to reflect a bi-weekly newspaper, rather than daily, which is in the current law. And that's it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Topinka moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 676. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 677. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 677.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd -- I mean, any Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Raica offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Amendment -- or Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 677 - on Page 1 deletes lines 25 through 27. Actually, the amendment becomes the bill, and inserting the words "including glass or plastic covers". This is pertaining to license plates just -- the Police Department is having a problem with automobiles that are putting plastic covers, or glass covers over the license plates. And this is only - clarifies the law to say that it now will become illegal to have glass or plastic covers on a license plate. And I just ask for a...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Raica moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 677. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 683. Senator Maitland. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 683.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Maitland. I mean, I'm sorry. Are there any Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Maitland offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 683 narrows the scope of the -- of the bill, to assure that is -- it is for a not-for-profit medical clinic. And I would move the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Maitland moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 683. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 685. Senator Kustra. Senator Kustra. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading at the bottom of the Page is Senate Bill 694. Senator Topinka. Read the bill please, Madam Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 694.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. At the bottom of the Page, Senate Bill 720. On the Order of 2nd Reading is - Senator Macdonald. Senator Macdonald on the Floor? Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 722. Pardon me, 720.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. ...(machine cutoff)... In our haste, we passed over a Floor amendment on Senate Bill 685. So, with leave of the Body, we'll return Senate Bill 685 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Kustra, on Amendment No. 2 -- 1 -- 1, I'm sorry. Senator Kustra.

#### SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment comes in response to some concerns that the Illinois Press Association has had of this bill. This is the bill that allows school boards to discuss, in an Executive Session, their plans for emergency security procedures and the utilization of personnel and equipment. This amendment tightens that particular provision, so there's no

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

opportunity for school boards to do anything more than that. I would urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? If not, Senator Kustra moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 685. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. Proceed to Page 12. Top of the page is Senate Bill 743, on the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 743.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Marovitz offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 deletes the provisions of the bill, except that one which clarifies the time period within which a second offense is considered, such for purposes of the Act as -- as dating from the date of the occurrence of the first offense. And I would ask for adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz moves for

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 743. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. And the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 744 and 752 have fiscal notes. We will skip over those. And on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 763. Senator Mahar. Senator Mahar on the Floor? Senator Mahar. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 768. Senator Severns. All right. That's been — the fiscal note's been satisfied. On the Order of 2nd Reading will be Senate Bill 768. Senator Severns. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 768.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading, in the middle of Page 12 is Senate Bill 771. Senator DeAngelis. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 771.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Any Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Bill -- 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 773. Senator Schuneman. Senator Schuneman on the Floor? I'm sorry. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 773.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd -- 2nd Reading is Senate 775. Senator Schuneman. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 775.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 7-7-7. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 779. Senator Philip. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 779.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. ...(machine cutoff)... In my -- I'm sorry.

Senator Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RALPH DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. 781 is the next bill on the -- I'd like to have the principal sponsor changed to Rea dash R. Dunn. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Heard the Senator's request. That request is in order, and the Secretary will make that note. In our haste, we passed over Senate Bill 744. Senator Marovitz. There had been a fiscal note requested, it, in fact, was on file. We will return, on Page 12, to the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 744. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Marovitz offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 strikes many of the provisions, but will allow us to remain parallel with the federal legislation, so that we don't lose any tax advantages to the State of Illinois. It's being worked out between the Attorney General's Office and the Chicago Bar Association. And I would ask for adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz moves the adoption of amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 744. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. Another bill that we inadvertently skipped over is Senate Bill 763. So, on the Order of 2nd Reading will be Senate Bill 763. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. We're down to the bottom of Page 12. Senate Bill 781. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senator Rea. Is Senator Rea in the Chambers? At the very bottom of the page, on 2nd Reading, is Senate Bill -- (...Machine cutoff). There's a fiscal note on 784. We'll move to the top of Page 13. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 787. Senator Vadalabene. 787. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 7-8-7.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 796. Senator Vadalabene. Read the bill please, Madam -- I'm sorry. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

## SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes. There is going to be an amendment for 787. I'd like to move it back on -- or else bring it back now.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Why don't we -- why don't we leave it on 3rd Reading and bring it back on a Recall List. Is that okay with you, Senator? All right. Senator Vadalabene, do you wish to proceed, on the Order of 2nd Reading, with Senate Bill 796? Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 796.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 801.

Senator Thomas Dunn. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 801.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Thomas Dunn offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment defines the term "newly constructed," and also puts a time limit on the abatement period.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Dunn moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment -- Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 801. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted.

Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 812. Senator Schaffer. Senator Schaffer on the Floor? Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 812.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 821.

Senator Netsch. Senator -- out of the record. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 832. Senator Smith. I mean, I'm sorry. Senator Macdonald. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 832.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Macdonald offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 1 took care - hopefully takes care, of the objections that were raised yesterday. In the percentage of privatization, it lowers from ten percent to five percent that percentage that we are recommending.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

We have also limited the bill to the RTA area only. So no other part of the State will be involved in this experimental program. And the top priority of the money saved will go to police protection. So, that's the amendment that I would like to have accepted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Macdonald moves to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 832. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 836. Senator Jacobs. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 836.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Labor offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Committee Amendment No. 1 strips the bill - puts it in shell form, for the purpose of accepting negotiated changes in the State's Collective Bargaining Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Jacobs -- moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 836. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the committee amendment's adopted. Further committee amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor Amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 853. With leave of the Body, Senator Daley will handle that for Senator Joyce. Senator Daley. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 853.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Any committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No committee amendments. No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments? Okay. 3rd Reading, I'm sorry. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 856. Senator Weaver. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 856.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 870.

Senator Severns. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 870.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, in the middle of the Page 13, is Senate Bill 886. Senator Berman. Is Senator Berman on the Floor? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate 894. Senator del Valle. Senator del Valle, for what reason do you arise?

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you Mr. President. I move to Table Senate Bill 894.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator del Valle has moved to Table Senate Bill 894. And -- all in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the bill is Tabled. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 896. Senator Zito. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 8-9-6.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 904. Senator Joyce. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary. Ask Senator Daley to have leave to handle that bill for Senator Joyce. Senator Daley.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 904.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 907. Senator Karpiel. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 907.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 911. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 911.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

-- I mean -- Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Raica offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment deletes everything after the enacting clause, to become the amendment. Amendment 1 amends the Illinois law governing provisions of the Title Declaration, which is the green sheet, for purposes of selling - by - either filled out by the buyer or seller. All this does is it's going to add - this amendment adds the provision of the green sheet acknowledging that the buyer and seller are advised that the State of Illinois has enacted the Smoke Detector Act. This is because of -- within the past six or seven months, there's been a numerous amount of fires. And ninety percent of the fires have shown that there were no smoke detectors in the homes. And this is just to advise all the parties involved in selling their home that they need to purchase a smoke detector.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

What will the language on the green sheet be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

I guess what it's going to have on a green sheet is that --

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

that the buyer and seller are advised that the State of Illinois has enacted the Smoke Detector Act, and exactly what that is. The Realtors had a problem with it, but this is an agreed amendment that -- from the State Fire Marshall's Office and the Realtors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Raica moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 911. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 918.

Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 918.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading, at the bottom of Page 13, is Senate Bill 936. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 936.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. At the top of Page 14. Senator Rigney your fiscal note has been answered. We will move with - on the Order of 2nd Reading, at the top of Page 14, Senate Bills - 938. Senator Rigney. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 938.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 942. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 942.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor Amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 943. Senator Geo-Karis. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 943.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. 944, 945 both have fiscal notes. On the Order of 2nd Reading we'll proceed to Senate Bill 964. Senator D'Arco. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 964.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator D'Arco offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 authorizes the Cook County Forest Preserve District to convey, by a quitclaim deed, an eight acre parcel of land in Niles. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? Senator Fawell. Is there any discussion on -- the amendment? If not, Senator D'Arco moves for the adoption of No. 1 to Senate Bill 964. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 966. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 966.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Fawell offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. First of all, a point of information.

On Senate Bill 945, I have a fiscal note from the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

We don't have it on file up here. We're on 966. Senate Bill 966.

SENATOR FAWELL:

All right. 966. All the amendment does is -- is take -- it's the State's Mandates Act. Removes...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Fawell moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 966. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 990. Senator Keats. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 990.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Keats offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This just takes a four line bill and makes it a five line bill, and is simply clarifying language with no change, whatsoever, in the intent of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator Keats moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 990. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, in the middle of Page 14, is Senate 1-0-0-4. Senator Schuneman. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1-0-0-4.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Schuneman offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment is a seventy-four page amendment which, basically, embodies what the Department had included in Senate Bill 1004, 1031 and 1033. It makes a series of technical changes, which I'd be happy to discuss, if there are any questions on the issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, Senator -- Senator Schuneman moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1-0-0-4. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Schuneman offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Schuneman, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Amendment No. 2 -- I hope I'm right about this. If the Secretary will check, one of those was a technical - just a one page technical amendment. Is that the one we adopted? Well, we just adopted the technical amendment, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 is the one that I previously described, which is the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. Senator Schuneman moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1-0-0-4. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further Floor amendments?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

...(machine cutoff)... No further amendments....(machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1-0-0-7. Senator Macdonald. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1-0-0-7.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1-0-0-8. Senator Madigan. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1-0-0-8.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor Amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1010. Senator Topinka. (machine cutoff) Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1010.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

3rd Reading...(machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senate Bill 1012. Senator Keats. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1012.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Keats offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an administration bill with an administration amendment. It is agreed-to by the Credit Union League, CPA Society, and the Department of Financial Institutions. Takes -- deletes from the bill language that has been put into a House Bill, so there's no point in having duplications. That's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Keats moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1013. Senator Keats. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1013.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Oh, what?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Keats offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Bring it back to 2nd Reading, Madam Secretary. 1013.

Amendment No. 1. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Immediate -- or excuse me, it's just an effective date.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Move the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments? Let's get these amendments squared away here.

Amendment No. 2?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

The second amendment, in reality, is a little more than a

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

line, and it actually spells out the implementation of -- of the successor clauses for these - in the corporate fiduciary area. Be glad to answer any questions, but a great amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio, on the amendment?

SENATOR DEMUZIO

No. Right after this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Okay. Any further discussion? Senator Keats moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm -- I'm actually the Senator from the 49th District. On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President, if I may...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

State your point.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

...We are delighted this morning to have the presence of Senator Vadalabene's wife, Mary, his daughter, and also his granddaughter visiting with us. And they're here on the Floor, and I wish that the Members of the Senate would recognize a tremendously Democratic family.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Welcome, Mrs. -- Vadalabene and family. Welcome. Sam, you're in good company. Senate Bill 1015. Senator Dunn. Read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1015.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Donahue offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Donahue.

#### SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Before I get into the explanation of this amendment, I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

What's your point?

# SENATOR DONAHUE:

I have some ladies that are here from the Area Agency on Aging in Hancock County, and they're in back gallery. I'd love to have them stand and be recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The ladies please stand to be recognized. Let's give them the Senate welcome. Welcome to Springfield. Enjoy your day. Senator Donahue, on Amendment No. 1.

# SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1015 is - reflects language that has been worked out between the oil and gas industry. It is -- deletes some language, and makes it purely technical. I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment No.

1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. On Page 15, Senate Bill 1029. Senator Kustra. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1029.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1030. Senator Madigan. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1030.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1032. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1032.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, Amendment No. 1 deletes from the bill reference to a disclosure of reserves. And I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment No.

All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No.

1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, Amendment No. 2 is an LRB suggestion -- relating to a minor grammatical change. And I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 2. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1035. Senator Rigney. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1035.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Netsch offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 1, which I am proposing to Senate Bill 1035, would change the investment credit to apply it to the State Income Tax, rather than to the corporate personal property tax. This is an issue that has arisen, as a matter of fact, from the very first day that the Investment Tax Credit was passed some years ago. It has argument, and is my argument today, that if we believe that the Investment Tax Credit is a matter of good tax policy, ought to have the decency to take it out of the State Income Tax, rather than thrusting it off onto the locals. It was put on local governments through the Replacement Tax Fund initially, because there was some feeling that there was going to windfall in the Replacement Tax Fund. That has, clearly, not been the case. It is not a huge sum of money, but it seems to me as a matter of tax policy and tax fairness that we, the State, ought to be willing to apply the Investment Tax Credit to our own State Income Tax.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Lady moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Any discussion? Senator Rigney.

## SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, Mr. President, I just kind of wish that maybe the sponsor would not put this amendment on to my bill. I don't want

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

anything on here that might possibly sink it. I think, you know, you can possibly do this through a straight up bill, clean from the beginning, rather than to come on to the bill this way with this type of an amendment. Pointed out it's only about fourteen million dollars, but as I look around various bills on the Calendar, it's ten million here, you know, fifteen million there. And this is one of these type of baggage type of amendments that I think could get us in trouble before June 30th.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Netsch, to close.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, I'm not so sure that it is excess baggage on your bill, Senator Rigney. The -- one of the things that I think you've got to realize is that some of our units of local government are hurting more than the State treasury at the present time. And what we are saying, is that the -- the benefit of the Investment Tax Credit should not be foisted off onto local governments. They didn't pass the bill in the first place. It was our idea. It is going to be our idea to extend it, and we ought to have the gumption to put our money where our mouths are, and pay for it out of the State tax, rather than out of local government taxes. I would suggest that - your local governments would be delighted to see this amendment on Senate Bill 1035.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. The Gentleman from Cook. Senator Dudycz, what purpose do you seek recognition?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

State your point.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We have some special guests today from Chicago. Up in the gallery behind us, we have a group of senior citizens from my district, and they're being chaperoned by two volunteers. One is Sandy Czerniuk, and the other is my wife, Oksana.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Would the ladies stand up and be recognized by the Senate. Welcome to Springfield. Mrs. Dudycz, welcome to Springfield as well. Oh, I'm sorry. Over here. Thank you. Gentleman - Senator Rigney, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, Mr. President that went by like a whistling freight train, and I thought we're going at least get a vote on that amendment, and it seemed like you adopted it without so much as even a voice vote. I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

That's not quite accurate.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

...want a roll call vote on that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

We'll get it on 3rd Reading. 1037. Senator Etheredge. You're light was not on. You didn't ask for a roll call. I'd be more than happy to give you a roll call, but we're not going back to it right now. Senator Etheredge. 1037. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Etheredge offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a technical amendment that corrects two drafting errors. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed. Amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1059. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1059.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. There's a request for a fiscal note on 1071.

1072. Senator Jones. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1072.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jones, Amendment No. 1

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. -- No. 1 is a rewrite; it's an agreed amendment, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1091. Senator Maitland. All right. There's been a fiscal note requested. I'm sorry. 1093. Senator Severns. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1093.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on ~- Economic Development
-- Commerce and Economic Development offers one committee
amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1 simply identifies the funding source. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Lady moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1095. Senator Severns. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1095.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1118. Senator Etheredge. Read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1118.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1125. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1125.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Barkhausen offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, the bill and the amendment are offered by the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loan. The amendment deletes the provision in the bill which would allow subsidiaries service corporations of State Chartered Thrifts to have access to the list of members of their parent Thrift. And I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1128 has a fiscal note. We'll turn

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

the page - it's been withdrawn? Okay. Senate Bill 1128. Senator Mahar.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1128.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Page 16, top of Page 16 is Senate Bill 1135. Senator D'Arco. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1135.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1139. Senator Maitland. Maitland.

1145. Senator Jacobs. Read - no? 1150. Senator Demuzio. 1158.

Senator Topinka. Please read the bill,

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1158.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1159. Senator Geo-Karis. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1159.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Geo-Karis offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. My amendment would exclude counties over six hundred thousand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1167. J. J. Joyce. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1167.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1168. Senator Joyce.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1168.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1171. Senator Welch. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1171.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Welch offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, pursuant to agreement with the Minority Spokesman, Senator Macdonald, this amendment strips the bill, and makes it into a vehicle bill. It ~ now it just corrects a grammatical error. I'd move for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment No.

1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

1's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1174. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1174.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1175. Senator Davidson. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1175.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading, 1177. Senator Kustra, 1179. Senator

Barkhausen. 1180. oh, I'm -- who's over there? 1179. Senator

Barkhausen. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1179.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. On 1180, there's a fiscal note, Senator Barkhausen. On top of Page 17. 1181. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1181.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Barkhausen offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, the bill, and the amendment itself, are offered by the Department of State Police. The amendment, I believe, is an agreed amendment. And I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1182. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1182.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Barkhausen offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members. The Amendment adds to the provision that one be operating a motor vehicle. It adds the words "or in actual physical control...of a motor vehicle," and I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1, be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. All opposed. Amendment No. 1, is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1184. Senator Topinka. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1184.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1257. Senator Topinka. Please read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1257.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1271. Senator Friedland. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1271.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senators Friedland and Schaffer offer Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Friedland, Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment 1 is -- makes technical changes suggested by Senate Enrolling and Engrossing. And I urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Friedland moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1282. Senator Joyce. J. J. Joyce.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 1286. Senator Luft. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1286.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Luft offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft, on Amendment No. 1. Floor amendment. 1286.

SENATOR LUFT:

Mr. President, we don't have a Floor amendment in hand, and have never seen one to our knowledge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

All right. We'll take the bill out of the record. You want to move it to 3rd Reading? Withdraw the -- one question, okay. Senator Luft, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an LRB amendment. It's technical; it -- ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

He moves its adoption. All in favor, signify by saying Aye.

Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1289. Senator Jones. 1298. Senator DeAngelis. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1298.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senators DeAngelis and Karpiel offer Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 1 exempts from the purposes of taxation, property owned and operated by a not-for-profit and -- charitable organization to be used for open space recreational purposes and a golf course provided that it has access to the public, and that the revenues that are derived from the operation are devoted...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me, Senator DeAngelis. Could we have your attention, please? Please continue, sir.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

...and are devoted exclusively to the enhancement of the organization's charitable and public service programs. This applies to the Cantigny Museum Property, which rests in Winfield, Illinois, and is in here because of a dispute that's currently going on, regarding whether the property should be taxed or not. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a -- an amendment to the Revenue Act involving a property tax exemption for a specific piece of property, Cantigny, and it's being offered as an amendment to a bill that doesn't have anything to do with that. I think it's, more or less, an insurance bill. And I'm going to question the germaneness of the amendment to the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady questions the germaneness, of Amendment No. 1 to 1298. It will just take a moment. We'll get back to that Order in business. The ruling of the Chair is that the amendment is not germane. It does not amend the same chapter. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, I beg to disagree because the -- the Act itself that it is amending, is on the charitable organizations. And this is a charitable organization.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Well, we've already made the ruling. Senator Netsch.

Well, what -- what I'm trying to suggest, Senator DeAngelis, is that when, you know, you start exempting particular pieces of property from the -- from the State - or from the property tax, that is a revenue matter - that is a property tax exemption, and it ought not be done by hanging it on to some other unrelated bill. Now, if you want to find another property tax exemption bill and try your amendment again, I won't raise the germaneness issue. But I really feel kind of strongly about not tacking property tax exemptions. I have some problem with the basic

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

concept of what you're doing, but the germaneness thing, I think, is quite important in this case.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

#### SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I don't want to prolong the debate on this, but Senator Netsch, if I were to take your interpretation of the scope of Revenue Committee or revenue activities, it would embody the entire General Assembly. Now, the part that I'm amending is, in fact, the part that applies to public charity. This property has been ruled exempt by the IRS and everybody else. Now, if you think this ought to be - belong on a regular private property bill, I would disagree on that. Because the exemptions you're talking about apply to privately owned property. This is a property that's owned by a charitable organization.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. On top of Page 18, Senate Bill 1316. Senator D'Arco. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1316.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1318. Senator Woodyard. Read the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1318.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Topinka offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Topinka, on Amendment No. 1 on 1318. Why don't we withdraw the amendment, and go to 3rd Reading. Take the bill out of the record. 1326. Senator Schaffer. Request of the sponsor -hold. 1329. Senator Topinka. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1329.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Is there a fiscal note request on 1332? 1333.

Senator Kustra. Okay. 1335. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1335.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1336. Senator Barkhausen. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1336.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1345. Senator DeAngelis. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1345.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 1350. There's a fiscal note on this. 1383.

Senator Marovitz. 1445. Senator Philip. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1445.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

3rd Reading. 1446. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1446.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Revenue offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Marovitz.

#### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1446 just clarifies the definition of licensed health facility. And I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1446. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1454, I'll hold. 1463. Senator Luft. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, top of Page 19, is Senate Bill 1463. Read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1463.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive, pardon me. No committee amendments.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any amendments from the Floor?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Luft offers Amendment No. 1.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 1 is technical in nature, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1463. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to withdraw Amendment No. 2. PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Amendment's been withdrawn. Further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 changes the funding source for the Affordable Home - Housing Act. We eliminate the present real estate transfer tax as a funding mechanism, and add the fifty cents rather - fifty dollars, rather than twenty-five dollars, as a transfer. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1463. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. ...(machine cutoff)... All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, so that everybody is on the same wave length, we will begin on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Obviously, we'll begin again tomorrow on 2nd Reading. But for the balance of today, which will be until roughly six o'clock, we'll begin on Senate Bills 3rd Reading. We'll begin were we left off in the five hundred series with 511. Senator Macdonald. And continue right down the line. Now, for your information, Senator Philip and I have been working on, and hopefully will have available for you, at the close of business today, an Agreed Bill List to, hopefully, expedite the work of this Senate. But in the meantime, I suggest that any Members who have bills on the Calendar, Friday is the deadline. And if once passed by, it's going to be difficult to get back around. ...(machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

# SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Before we begin on 3rd Reading, there is a congratulatory resolution that is a Senate Joint Resolution, which the House is anxious to act upon, because the recipient is Mr. John Johnson whose a friend of all of ours, I'm sure. Senate Joint Resolution 64 is a congratulatory resolution in favor of Mr. Johnson who is to receive an award this evening, I am told, from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. With leave of the Body, I'd like to go to the Order of the Consent Calendar, and ask that ~ or the Order of Resolutions, Senate Joint Resolution 64 now resides

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

on the Consent Calendar. I'd ask for suspension of the rules, and the immediate consideration and adoption of this joint resolution sponsored by myself and all Members of the Senate; and send it over to the House for their approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, we'll qο Resolutions Consent Calendar. Leave is granted. On the - Senator moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and -- and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 64, a congratulatory resolution. Those in favor will indicate by saying The Ayes have it. The rules are Opposed Nay. Senator Rock now moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate Joint Resolution 64 is adopted. Now. with leave with the Body, we will return to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading on Page 26. ... (machine cutoff)... Senate Bill Senator Macdonald. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 511, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 511.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

# SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think had Senator Rock and Senator Philip had an opportunity to meet before 3rd Reading today, that this bill would have been on their Agreed Bill List. It was on an Agreed Bill List before our stalemate occurred in the Senate. It is a State Board of Elections Bill, amends the Election Code to provide automatic repeal of the State Board of Elections two year exemption from polling place accessibility

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

requirements for handicapped and elderly voters. And it permits temporarily - permanently disabled voters to request a delivery of a ballot outside the polling place on election day. It also permits physically incapacitated electors to vote on paper ballots in the voting machine jurisdictions. I -- I think this is a non-controversial bill, and I would ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

...(machine cutoff)... -- any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 511 pass. Those in favor, will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. All who voted who wish? All who voted who wish? All who voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 511, is declared passed. Senate Bill 513. Senator Hawkinson. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 513.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 513 is an initiative offered by Secretary of State, Jim Edgar, which changes the testing of drivers at the senior citizen level. Under current law, drivers must take a behind the wheel test at age 69 - with a license that is good for four years. This proposal would recognize statistics which show that there's no reason to require the test at age 69, and would defer this test until age 75. The test then would be deferred to age 75, and would be for a four-year license until age 81. Between ages 81 and 86 a two-year test would be given. And after age 87 an annual test would be

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

given. The bill was amended so there would be no increased costs for these tests and, in fact, the annual license test would be given for no fee. The two year test; a two dollar fee. I would ask for the passage of this bill, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 513 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, 4 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 513, is declared passed. Senate Bill 514. Senator Thomas Dunn. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 514.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. This is the charitable trust acts which will streamline the reporting period to the Attorney General's Office and correct abuses that have occurred in the system.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 514 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 514 is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

declared passed. Senate Bill 515. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 515.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 515 increases from twenty cents to thirty cents the per column line, the minimum advertising rate that can be paid for publication material required by law to be printed in newspapers. This rate has only been changed once in the last thirty-eight years. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 515 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. All who voted who wish? All who voted who wish? All who voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 49 Ayes, 3 Nays, 2 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 515, is declared passed. Senate Bill 517. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 517.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill was introduced at the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

request of some school districts in Chapman and Cutler. When a school district is out of funds and cannot pay teachers' salaries, they submit an order - what you call a Teachers Order - to the bank. Presently those orders do not have to be numbered and -- nor have a maturity date on them. It is felt that they would receive a better interest rate and be received by the banks in a much higher light if we would require that they be numbered, and we make it permissive that they have a maturity date. I would try to answer any questions, or ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 517 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 517 is declared passed. Senate Bill 518. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 518.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank -- thank you very much. I have four bills in a row here. They're all township bills that were - I was asked to handle by the Township Association. The first one merely adds a Supervisor and Administrator of General Assistance under - to report abused children and abused adults.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the -- I'm sorry. Senator Jacobs.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Wrong one. If -- if not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 518 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 518, is declared passed. Senate Bill 519. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 519.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. What -- this is also a TOA bill. Basically, what it does is - it's an Act to prevent fraudulent and corrupt practices, with relation to official appointments and contracts. And it prohibits a township supervisor or trustee, during the term of election, to be appointed to hold any office by the appointment of the board of trustees unless a leave of absence is granted. What I was told was happening - was that there were a couple of townships that were setting up commissions, salarying the commission, and then they were appointing themselves to the commission, and, in effect, collecting two salaries. This is a practice that the township officials themselves would like to stop. And - so I would ask your support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

Senator Fawell, I -- I talked to you about this bill a little bit

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

earlier. This bill is really a dangerous bill. What you're trying to do makes -- makes a lot of sense, and I agree with what you're trying to do. But any time that you can give an elected official a leave of absence, we are breaking some serious, serious ground here. We are setting precedent that I don't think we want to set. Question then would be of the Senator, if we are to -- if we are to -- to go into this muddy water, this unclear water, regards to whether or not we're going to give leave of absences to elected officials; how long is that leave of absence for? Can it be up until the time that you take your duty to go to a meeting attend your meeting - again resign - or take a leave of absence right after the meeting - until the next meeting? I just think that this provision of the bill - I'd like to see you hold it. I like to see an amendment on this bill that would address that issue, 'cause it's a real serious situation, in my estimation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

## SENATOR FAWELL:

Why don't you take it out of the record. I'll see if I can get an amendment tonight, and we can bring it back to 2nd Reading. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Take it our of the record, Mr. Secretary. Senate Bill 520. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 520.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is, again, a township bill. All it does - is it allows the township supervisor, with the advice and

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

consent of the township board of trustees, to employ, and fix the compensation of a Township Attorney, and other such employees, as the supervisor and the board of trustees may deem necessary. It does exclude the employees of the Supervisor of General Assistance, Township Collector and the Township Assessor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

What we are doing is authorizing the townships to hire people they presently can't hire. Something is - townships normally hire people on their own. What are -- why are we authorizing these new things?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

There has been a question of -- of who may employ, and fix the compensation, and this says - supervisor, with the consent and approval of the township trustees. It's been a question of whether the trustees have that authority, or the supervisor has that authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is -- I'm sorry, Senator Schuneman. Senator Schaffer.

#### SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I've always been a little cautious. Sometimes these township governments get in a little feud. Whose employees are they setting the salaries for? The Township Road Commissioner, for instance?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

It -- it excludes the Office of Supervisor of General Assistance, Township Collector and Township Assessor. That's language that's already in the bill - I mean that's already in the law. It doesn't say anything about the Road Commissioner, one way or the other.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Would you're law allow the town board to set the salaries for the township road district, which is currently the purview of the township road commissioner? And is this bill sponsored by the Township Officials Association?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

It is sponsored by the Township Association, yes - Dave Regner. It shifts - it's just the -- the hiring and -- and the -- and the salaries to the supervisor and the board of trustees. It doesn't change the language as far as the road commissioners, one way or other.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I want to know, if I'm a Township Road Commissioner, and I've been hiring - I'm a separate entity, I'm a township road district, does this bill in any way, shape, or form take my power, to hire people, away from me - to set salaries, and any purview that I have right now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? Senator Philip.

#### SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I -- I hope I understand this bill. What I think it does - it allows the township officials, whether it be a supervisor, an assessor, or a road commissioner, to set the salary of his employees with the consent of the board of trustees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

All this is doing - this, you know, the Supervisor of General Assistance, the Township Collector, and the Township Assessor, are removed from this prerogative. The town - let me read you the exact bill, and the underlined word is the "Township Supervisor with the consent and approval of the", that's what underlined, "township board of trustees may employ, and fix the compensation of a township attorney and such other employees as a supervisor, and the board of trustees may deem necessary, excluding the employees of the Office of the Supervisor General Assistance, Township Collector, and Township Assessor".

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 520 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 45 Ayes, 6 Nays, 3 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 520 is declared pass. Senate Bill 522. Senator Fawell. Read the bill,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 522.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is the last of the bills, and it — and it allows the township board of trustees to adopt the personnel policies of the — of the employees of the township. It does exclude the employees of the general assistance, the Township Collector, the Township Assessor, and the Township Road Commissioner. I'm not sure who else is left, to tell you the truth, but anyway, what it does — it allows them to set the — the hours and the days that they can get off, et cetera.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Senator Hawkinson,

### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. I have no opposition to the bill, but I would only note to the sponsor that this bill directly exempts the road commissioner, and her prior bill did not. And she might want to look at that prior bill for a specific exclusion in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

The bill sets up - question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR KEATS:

Allows there to be a personnel officer designated. Is this

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

allowing them to hirer a new person, or designating an existing person to do these functions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

It says that -- it doesn't say anything about hiring anyone else, no. It just that the township board has the right to adopt, may adopt, it's a permissive - personnel policies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Keats.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

Okay. As I was reading my analysis, it talks about a Personnel Officer. What I just want to make sure is we are not authorizing the hiring of a Personnel Officer, 'cause there aren't fifteen townships in this State that have enough work for a Personnel Officer. And this would be a little more than payroll padding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

Let me read the -- the language of the bill. It says, "the township board of trustees may designate the officer or other person to administer the procedures and personnel policies." It doesn't say anything about hiring anybody else. It's just that they can designate someone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

### SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

I'm - I'm sorry, Senator Keats had not completed his
questions. Senator Keats, again.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR KEATS:

Okay. Then could I make an affirmative statement that you would concur with. This does not authorize the hiring of a personnel officer, this is not authorizing simply payroll padding by adding another person. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

It doesn't prohibit anybody from being hired, but it sure as heck doesn't give them permission either. You know, township government in -- in -- in different sections of the State are -- are different, Senator Keats. In my townships, we do have twenty-five, thirty people that are on the payroll right now for township government, that's not that unusual. A township supervisor will, perhaps, explain it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

# SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

## SENATOR SEVERNS:

Senator, I realize the Township Officials of Illinois, at least based on our analysis, is -- is the organization that's requested this language. My question to you is - aren't townships already authorized to do what this language provides? Is there anything in the law that precludes them from performing this function now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Number one, this is permissive language, let me make sure you understand that. The second thing is, apparently there has been some problems in the various townships on who has this authority. Is it the township trustees? Is it the township supervisor? This bill specifically says it's the board of trustees -- that has that authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator. Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Senator Fawell, I'm sorry I didn't get in on the first part of this debate, and I -- I'm not aware whether the - I didn't want to interrupt you and just go up to the desk. Did -- was this bill amended? Is there an amendment on this that cleared up the problem we had with the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

This -- this is - no - this is the bill that just says that the - that they can't set the policies for the Supervisor of General Assistance, Township Collectors, Township Assessor, and Township Road Commissioner. They only said for whoever's left.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I'm sorry, but who is left?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

I guess they are, and the Township Supervisor. City Township Supervisor, himself, and the Township Board of Trustees are left.

I -- and a secretary, or whoever else they have answering the phone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Karpiel.

### SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, now this is a serious question. I'm a past Township Supervisor. And as a Township Supervisor, by law, you also serve as Supervisor of General Assistance. Are there some townships that appoint somebody different that's the Township Supervisor of — of General Assistance. Because if that's not the case, there is nobody left in this bill that would be able to hire anyone. So, I don't know what we're doing with the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

In -- in -- in answer to your question, there are some other personnel. If you remember there are some personnel, for instance, that answer the phones, the secretaries, the clerks, that type of thing. I - at least we have it in my townships. And that would be the ones that would - that they would control.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any further discussion? Senator Fawell, may close. SENATOR FAWELL:

Just ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

On that - the question is, shall Senate Bill 522 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that -- on that question, there are 17 Ayes, 28 Nays, 5 voting Present. Having

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

failed to receive the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 522 is declared lost. Senate Bill 525. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate 525.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. Each year we attempt to enhance the availability of those companies in enterprise zones. Senate Bill 525 is a vehicle bill, we hope will wind up somewhere in a conference committee. If, in fact, those people meeting discover ways to enhance the availability of a enterprise zone, that language will be amended at that point. Acknowledging that this is a vehicle, I would ask for the passage of Senate Bill 525.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 525 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 525 is declared passed. Senate Bill 526. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 526.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. As you all remember, last year we passed a TIF reform package that mandated a tier 1 and tier 2 review of all TIF bills. This is a vehicle awaiting the outcome of those reviews, to find out what is necessary for the legislature to do to further restrict any potential abuses of the TIF districts. And I would ask for a favorable roll call on Senate Bill 526.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 526 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received a constitutional majority, Senate Bill 526 is declared passed. Senate Bill 527. Senator Luft. Senate Bill 529 was amended today. Senate Bill 535 is skipped, permission of the sponsor. Senate Bill 540. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 540.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Demuzio.

#### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. 540 simply increases the time frame for bids that would be received by a school board from three, to five days. There's has been some concern expressed in my district. And I'm sure we'll have not seen the last of this. And it'll come back in some other form, I suspect.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 540 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, 1 Nay, 2 voting Present. Having received a constitutional majority, Senate Bill 540 is declared passed. Senate Bill 541. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 541.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you. Senate Bill 541 is simply technical in nature. It cleans up some language in the Act. We can't have misspelled words and those kind of things in the Statutes, so this will provide us the opportunity to correct it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 541 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 541 is declared passed. Senate Bill 555. Senator Weaver. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 555.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Weaver.

# SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you -- thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 555 does just as the Calendar states. I'd like to send it over to the House. It's a former -- possible vehicle for a motor fuel tax increase.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 5-5-5 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 9 Noes, 2 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 5-5-5 is declared passed. Senate Bill 563. Senator Maitland. Senator Maitland. Senator Maitland. Senator Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 571.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment is a shell bill for the purpose of accepting negotiated changes in the State's Collective Bargaining Act, and ask for its approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 571 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Noes, 1 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 571 is declared is passed. Senate Bill 573. Senator Jacobs.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 573.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill amends the Quad-city Economic Development Authority. It makes it whole with the Economic Development Authority of the Southwestern Illinois Authority Development Act. It was an oversight last year. And it does incur the moral obligation of this State, ask for its approval, be ready to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 573 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On the question, there are are 40 Ayes, 12 Nays, 3 voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 573 is declared passed. Senate Bill 577. Senator Jones. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 577.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jones.

### SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 577 amends the Insurance Code and allows an insured to be covered for mental, emotional and nervous disorders to choose a licensed clinical social worker and to -- and for to conduct -- to conduct treatment, and also it make other...other technical changes. This bill is not a mandated coverage, as many of you have probably been told. What it does is give the consumers a choice. It simply provide that the insurance policy which offer mental health coverage should -- should also cover the services of a licensed clinical social worker. And Illinois, if you work toward a totally drug-free Illinois, many, many persons who are drug addicted and are on -- on alcohol or other chemical drugs, them go to a clinical social worker. Nineteen states currently have this law. Our federal government, sixteen million federal employees mandate that -- clinical social workers be included in that coverage. And I'll answer any question anyone has on this bill. And I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

# SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well thank you, Madam President. I really don't understand why the sponsor insists that this is not a mandate, because of course it is. It is an additional level of treatment that insurance companies will be required to offer to policyholders. Now an interesting thing about these bills that we pass around here mandating additional care and mandating additional costs. I think the first thing you ought to consider, isn't your health insurance costly enough? Isn't it costly enough? You want to mandate more coverages and more costs? That's precisely what this bill does,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

because it allows -- it...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator... For what purpose? State your point, Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Just a point of order. Currently right now, Senator Schuneman, in all policies up to ten thousand dollar, this coverage is already there. We are not mandating that coverage. It is already there. All this bill does is provide that a licensed clinical social worker, a -- a policyholder may choose, if they so desire, to have that treatment by a licensed clinical social worker. The mandated benefit's -- the benefit's already in the policy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, thank you. I think that's rather unusual to allow someone to break in during a presentation, Madam President. simple fact of the matter is, that this...that this bill will require that insurance companies include in their specific mandated coverage that is not now in the policies. Now there's no way of escaping that. There is mental or nervous disorder coverage in the policies now, but it does not give the covered person the option of consulting a clinical social worker. And that's what this policy does -- or that's what this bill does. This bill is opposed by the people that are going to have to pay the cost. And basically, that's the small employers of Illinois. ones -- understand that when we pass a bill around here mandating additional coverages, there's a whole wide range of employers that we don't affect. We don't affect the State of Illinois group insurance. We don't affect the insurance for Company. We don't affect the insurance for Caterpillar Tractor Sears or any of the major employers in the State of Illinois, because the federal government says we can't. So who's left with

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

the -- with the burden of paying these costs? It's the small employer who is not covered by the federal ERISA plan. And I have nothing against social workers. They do a good job, and many times are recommend by psychologists and others who -- whose services are mandated to be covered under -- under the law now. But this is, regardless of what others will tell you, an additional mandated coverage, and it will have an additional cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

## SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President -- or Madam President. I don't normally disagree with my colleague, Senator Schuneman. Senator Schuneman, if you will look at line 12, the -- the coverage is already offered. In fact, it says, "shall offer." And what this bill really does, it gives you a choice between who is going to do what you're looking for. And I have to tell you, between the three choices if this bill's passed, this is the least expensive choice. And in many instances, the only available choice. And I have, as a former employer, have -- have always been concerned about increasing medical costs. But let me read vou. just briefly, parts of a letter that were written by one of the largest employers in the State of Illinois, AT&T. 4 TA" T's experience in utilizing social workers to treat employees and families has been most positive and beneficial. Τn reimbursement for social workers through our insurance plans, we have not found our costs rising." In thirty-four counties in Illinois, a social worker is the only treatment alternative available. In many areas of Chicago, social work services are whereas other reimbursable counseling is located some distance away from the consumer. I really do believe we ought pass this, because for those who are concerned about rising medical costs, this is a more competitive and less costly

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

alternative.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Holmberg.

### SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill, I would like to again just to reemphasize to Senator Schuneman as Senator DeAngelis did, would not mandate any new benefits. It's only available to those people who already have mental health benefits. It just gives them a choice, which in most cases would be for a -- a cheaper cost. You're going to a licensed social worker in -- clinical social worker, and I think if any of you had the experience within your family of having someone seek counseling, you'll find the rates may be half that that you would pay for a clinical psychologist or for a psychiatrist. Not all kinds of mental problems or counseling demand the same kind of specialist. Many people need choice. The companies that have tried this - IBM, United Airlines, American Airlines, Honeywell - have all found that it's been a benefit to their policies. And I, too, am worried about those thirty-four counties in the State of Illinois where the only mental health services is a social worker. Should we be denying those people the help they need? This bill would enable those thirty-four counties to have that choice, and to be able to get the mental -- mental counseling that they need for themselves and for their families, within the family structure of those counties.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 577 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. I'm sorry. Your -- Is your light on, Senator Jones? Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Jones, to close. SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. As pointed out -- as pointed out, this coverage is already offered in the policies. In many communities downstate, there are no

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

psychiatrists. And with the drug and alcohol problem that we have in the State of Illinois, we need the clinical social workers. Because many of those persons who might go to a psychiatrist, or might go to a psychologist, they are referred to a clinical social worker and many of them to do the job. It does not increase cost but — but to the contrary, it reduces the cost. And — and for those of you who have been contacted about this being a mandated coverage, you cannot mandate something that is already in most of the policies that are offered. So what this bill does, saying simply, if you offer this coverage, then you must include in there the clinical social workers. I ask for a favorable vote.

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 577 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Ayes, 20 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 577, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 589. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 589.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Mahar.

#### SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This does exactly what the Calendar states. On behalf of the Korean War Veterans, they've requested that their commemorative holiday - their existing commemorative holiday, be changed from July 27 to during the school year, which has been selected at the - let's see - the school day immediately

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

preceding Veterans Day. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 589 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On there - that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 589, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Channel 20 requests permission to videotape proceedings. Do they have leave? -- Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senate Bill 593. Senator Holmberg. Senator Holmberg. Senator Bill 606. Senator Jacobs. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 606.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Jacobs.

# SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill requires school boards to notify educational support personnel of transfers. It's part of the IEA's legislative package. Senator Berman, if you will, there was an amendment to be put on this bill that - we were supposed to be contacted by the School Board Association. They have not contacted us, so I'd like to move this bill on, and try to work something out in the House. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Kustra. Kustra.

# SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. You were right, the first time. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Oh really.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Senator Jacobs what - what's the rationale for what appears to be a difference in -- in standard here? It looks like what you're doing is giving employees a thirty-day probationary period, after which time discipline cannot be given without just cause. But teachers in the same school district are given a minimum of two years to have -- or let's see -- school districts have minimum of two years to evaluate the performance of certified personnel before granting tenure. So, certified personnel gets two year probationary period, and we take it down to thirty days for custodians, secretaries, and cafeteria personnel. Why -- why the different standard?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Number one, Senator, I would hope that we would hold a school teacher, which is molding the minds, to a different set of standards, than we would a janitor who may be sweeping the floor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 606 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 17 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 606, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 611. Senator O'Daniel. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 611.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. All this does is make a language change in the legislation we passed the last session, that would give a land owner a little protection if he allowed the public to hunt, or to have recreational activities on his land. This is little clarification of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 611 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 611, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 612. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 612.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 612 requires a teacher of a course to determine the final grade for a pupil. Apparently, it - the process that exists today - that the teacher can grant a grade, and somewhere else in the system can change that grade.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

This simply states that the teachers grade will be final.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 612 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote No-Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 612, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 614. Senator Collins. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 614.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 614 is an effort to provide incentives to encourage males to enter into the teaching profession and, particularly, to get black males and minority males to teach in the school systems. Being that young males have very few opportunities in many instances, especially those from single parent families, to have a very positive, a permanent, I mean a dominant role -- male role model in their lives. So, what this bill does, it -- it grants scholarships to minority males to teach in the public schools for two years after they -- certified to teach. And it also allow them to teach in non-public schools, at the request of an amendment put on by the representatives of the Catholic School System. So, I would be happy to answer any questions, if not, I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. A question of the sponsor, if she'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

She'll indicate she will yield.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator Collins, the -- it's my understanding that this addresses just minority males, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, it does. I don't have any problems with including this to males. In reading the latest report issued by the State Board of Education, there is a shortage of all males teaching in the schools. And they called it to our attention, indicating that it is a problem that does need some attention given to. So, I would be open to amending the bill, to include incentives to males, in the House, if that's what you want.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Maitland.

## SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, do you have any idea of what the cost on this would be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

According to a fiscal note I have here from the Scholarship Commission, it's seven hundred and thirty thousand dollars. But that seems to be high, because some of these people already qualify for existing scholarships, anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, I'll -- I'll get to that point in a minute. But -- but it would -- assume for a moment that the seven hundred thousand is -- is a correct figure. Does that money not, then, come from some other area of the Scholarship Commission?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

What do you mean, does it come from some other area of the Scholarship Commission?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

My point is, Senator, every time we set -- set aside a category here, we -- we withdraw some of the available money from the overall program, and that concerns me. So, I think the Body ought to be -- be aware of that - that the scholarships we are getting, unless we bump this in that amount, obviously, there are going to be some students who otherwise would have received a grant will not. My next concern, Senator, is the fact that, I believe, the way the legislation is drafted, it is possible for an individual to get - to qualify for the normal needs grant, and also get this grant, is that not true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

No. That is not true. Now if -- if that is a -- if it's so, it is a technical error; but that is not the intention of the bill. And I don't know if you could -- if it's possible under existing law to receive two scholarships. I know that you cannot receive a legislative scholarship from the Commission, and then

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

turn around and receive the regular scholarship, because they're basically the same. So, that's not possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Maitland.

### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, just finally, Mr. President, there is no prohibition in — in the language as — as we read it. So, I think it is — you know, very definitely a concern. I think this whole issue is a — is a problem, and I don't disagree with you. But I — I — in this period of time, when we have limited funding, and not knowing where the revenue is coming from I — I just believe the Body ought to oppose the measure, at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Kustra.

# SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this piece of legislation, and I -- I'm frankly, little disappointed in the opposition, and I'll tell you why. We cry crocodile tears on both sides of the aisle, year after year, about those horrible inner city schools, and how we ought to do something about them. How we ought to turn things around. And we know that one of the big problems is that Federal and State Affirmative Action Programs have made it very lucrative for young minority students to take jobs in law firms - go to the best law schools - go to the best medical schools - go into medical practice. And passed by along the way, are our Elementary and Secondary Educational Facilities. We simply don't have the same kind of encouragement in this State, or anyplace in this country, to foster and encourage young blacks or minorities to get into teaching, the way we focus on some of the other more lucrative It's time we do that. I don't know whether this professions. bill has all the t's crossed and the i's dotted, but it's an

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

awfully good attempt to deal with that. I certainly concur with Senator Maitland, if there are some problems that need to be worked out, let's do it. But I would disagree that we should tube this bill. Let's work out these difficulties. I think this is an awfully good idea. We ought to pass it, and let the House clean it up. But, my gosh, if we're concerned about inner city schools and Chicago School Reform, here's another way to get at the problem. I say vote, Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins, to close.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you. Let me just say there are other states who are doing the same thing, too. And -- and large metropolitan areas who are trying to provide incentives to get males to go into the teaching profession. Senator, let me just respond to some of your concerns, as -- as it relates to the cost of this program. If, in fact, the Scholarship Commission have scholarships to give out, anyway, there should be nothing wrong with them taking a look at, and encouraging -- in giving out those scholarships, to ensure that more males are involved in -- in the whole teaching profession. I think this is a concept that is long overdue. And I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 614 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 17 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 614, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 619. Senator Collins.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

This is -- is an amendment that actually...

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

I'm sorry. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. I'm sorry.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 619.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a bill that is establishing a demonstration program by DASA dealing with the problems substance abuse, mothers and their children. This program is already in the budget as proposed, and it is in the process being established by DASA. They did sign off on the bill. The demonstration will in fact be in the area of Chicago, and I think there already starting one downstate, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

All right. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 619 pass. Those in favor vote, Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, 3 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 519 -- 619 having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Keats, for what purpose to you rise?

### SENATOR KEATS:

A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

State your point.

### SENATOR KEATS:

On Senate Bill 614, I had voted in the affirmative, and wasn't

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

even that close of a vote. I know I hit the switch, and it did not record. So, I would request that it show that I voted yes, and I don't know why it didn't record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

The record will so indicate.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins. Senate Bill 622. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 622.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. This -- this bill is -- is rather simple, and it simply adds to the already existing Health Care Act in the school systems which - and it just simply say that we will expand that Act to include the teaching of the medical and legal ramifications of uses -- the use of drugs and tobacco during pregnancy. And I would be happy to answer any questions. If not, I would move for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Is this another unfunded educational mandate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

No. This -- this - there's -- there's really no fiscal impact

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

on this bill at all. Because we already have that program now in the schools. So, it just expand the program, itself, to include the teaching of these of those - that particular subject matter. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Topinka.

### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. There is, apparently, a fiscal impact, but the Department of Public Health is just not quite sure what it is. But they seem to feel that the cost of implementation would vary by the type of media. For example, radio, TV, posters, flyers, billboards and, you know, how sophisticated those materials may be. So this could have kind of a buried and hidden fiscal problem, which we kind of can see, but can't feel and touch at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Collins to -- Senator Demuzio.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I think just for a point of clarification with Senator Schaffer's question. In the Act itself, it says in Section 3, "the comprehensive health education programs," and it goes on to list that "the program established hereunder shall include, but not be limited to," and it goes on to talk to human ecology and health, et cetera, so forth and gets down to personal health habits, alcohol, drug use and abuse. And Senator Collins is adding the medical, legal ramifications of alcohol, drug, tobacco use and abuse during pregnancy. I assume that is in addition to those things that should be taught within that health category. And therefore, even though it does say shall, it just seems to me they're probably already doing it in the school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

All right. Senator Collins, do you wish to, close? SENATOR COLLINS:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Demuzio - closing - I would just appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 622 pass? Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Ayes, 15 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 622, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Berman. 625. Senator Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Indicate your point.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

It's my pleasure to introduce to the Senate today, the Illinois Council of Senior Citizens from St. Veronica's Senior Citizens group, in the back gallery. Would you please rise and be recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Would you please rise and be recognized by the Senate.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Welcome to Springfield, ladies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Berman. 625. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 625.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Berman.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SENATOR BERMAN:

This is a bill that was requested by the title insurance companies. And what it provides — is to allow the property owner to redeem under protest, for reasons that were intended in the original bill, but were limited by the language when the — when the amendment was added several years ago. And and — that broadens the rights of the property owner for redemption, not limited to the certificate holders notice. That is the only stated allowable reason at the present time. It can go beyond that such as an error in payment and other justifiable reasons for redemption. Be glad to respond to any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Any discussion? Senator Keats.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

I'm trying to clarify the amendment, so it's a question to - of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

He indicates he'll yield.

### SENATOR KEATS:

One of our problems in major metropolitan areas is getting these properties back on the tax rolls, getting owners into fixing them up, and whatever. And we've been intentionally trying to shorten the amount of time involved to get these properties back on the tax rolls. On your amendment, I'm reading the -- the explanation, and I'm not so sure what that amendment really does. 'Cause under the bill, it looks like it'd would be extremely difficult to get something back on the tax roll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Berman.

# SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. Just so there's no misunderstanding. Your explanation is correct, and the amendment restated that. This is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

-- this has nothing - the bill is not intended to allow a redemption on the basis of unfair assessment. It is really - merely deals with the technical questions of whether there was payment, proper notice, et cetera. So that -- that was what the amendment does; and this is not to be used as a method to contest the assessment process for the -- for the property.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

And there're no deadline changes that I can find. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 625 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 625, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 4

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?
SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President. In Senate Bill 619, my switch was mistakenly pushed No, and it was supposed to have been pushed Aye. And I would like the record to reflect that I am in support - full support of Senate Bill 619.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

The record will so reflect. Senate Bill 629. Senator Hall. It's on Recall, Senator Berman. 629. Senator Hall. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 629.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR D'ARCO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill, 629 has the full support of the Illinois Community College Board. As some of you here present, I certainly know that that Senator Philip and Senator Vadalabene and Senator Newhouse certainly remember, twenty years ago when Governor Ogilvie formed what was called a Experimental Community College District in my area. And since that time, that they have now, at the suggestion of the Audit Commission and others, that they're going to create a - in 1990, January 1st, a State two-year college in East St. Louis, to be named the State Community College, and no longer be experimental. It abolishes the current board of trustees, effective January 1, 19 <sic>, and creates a Statewide board of trustees of State Community College, to consist of seven members, the present board has nine, four of whom shall reside in the former district, and three shall be from around the State. The Members of the board of trustees will be appointed by the Governor, with the consent of the Senate, from nominations submitted to the Governor from the Illinois Community College Board. Now of this that it will - the college has had problems. It hasn't been able to grow because that the areas - and people that moved out. This way they can reach out and bring in others, and it can require a concentration of educational programs

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

emphasizing vocational, technical, remedial and adult education. And so -- this is what is vitally needed in that area, and this will be a catalyst that will be very beneficial to everybody in that district. So, I would ask for your most favorable support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Gentleman from Bond, Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Currently Senator, I -- I think we totally fund the State

Community College located in East St. Louis, the State. Is that

correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hall. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

That's correct.

SENATOR WATSON:

What will change here then, Senator. I mean as far as the fiscal impact of the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

The funding mechanism will be the same for this. But eventually, that there will be an assessment, a tax for the people in that district; and they will have to begin to pay like the rest of the district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

All right. So I guess then that could ultimately be a savings here, as far as funding from -- from a State appropriation, it'll be funding, then, locally through a property tax that will take carry on the school. Another question, Senator. What's going to happen with the buildings?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

It's - the buildings are still going to be there. The college will be there, but they'll be - they can -- they can - what we call charge back - and - which they do right now with Belleville Area College and all. It will, eventually - it will become part of the Belleville Area College district. The buildings are there, and they're still going to - that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR HALL:

...It becomes a two-year State College.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Etheredge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

We'll get to it. Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is a good bill designed to address a problem that we've been dealing with down here for a number of years. I think it provides a very reasonable solution. One that can be worked out over the next several years, so I would urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hall, to close.

SENATOR HALL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Just ask for your most favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 629 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 631. Senator Welch. It's on Recall? Okay. 632. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 632.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

# SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. 632 is a bill that we passed out in the last Session of the General Assembly. What it does is preclude any school board member who is an employee, owner, or officer of a bank or savings and loan having a contract to deposit monies, loans or financial service with a school district, that person would not be able to serve as the school board's treasurer. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 632 pass?

All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. On Page 29.

Top of Page 29 is Senate Bill 634. Senator Welch. Read the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 634.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Currently there exists in the Statute a homestead improvement exemption. Unfortunately, many constituents don't know about that exemption, and that's how this bill was brought to my attention. What this bill does, is require assessors and supervisors of assessments to notify an owner of a homestead property of possible eligibility for that improvement exemption when the assessed value of the property increases, due to the improvement of an existing structure. A fiscal note was requested. In the opinion of DCCA, it was a local government organization and structure mandate, for which no reimbursement is required. This will be a minimum act on the part of a local government, basically to tell a person when they have a building permit that they are entitled to an exemption, once their property is improved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 634 All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take On this question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none the record. recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 635 is on Recall. 636 on Recall. 637. Senator Welch. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 637.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. This bill will prohibit the use or possession of any form of a pocket pager, except for medical necessity, by pupils on school property. It provides for imposition of penalties for violations. I'd be glad to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 637 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 638 is on Recall. 645. Senator Woodyard. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 645.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is one of a series of Illinois Farm Development Authority bills, and it removes the Cap on the net worth of an individual farmer for the agency to be able to extend loan guarantees to that farmer. The reason for this is, because of that Cap, we are reaching a point in which we can no longer do loan guarantees on some of the turkey production units that are moving into the State of Illinois. This bill was to have been on an Agreed Bill List, but we decided to go ahead and call the bill at this time, and I would ask your

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Questions is, shall Senate Bill 645 pass. All in favor vote Aye. All opposed vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, and none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 647. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 647.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This was like the previous bill, to be on the Agreed Bill List. It simply would afford - the interest earned off the investments of funds that are held in the Illinois Agriculture Loan Guarantee Fund, and the Illinois Farmer Agri-Business and Loan Guarantee Fund shall remain in the Fund. Currently, the interest goes to the General Revenue Fund. This is a - I know --know of no -- no -- no controversy or opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

-- Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 647 pass. All in favor vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 Ayes, 1 Nay, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 648. Senate Bill 648. Senator Demuzio. The Gentleman from Cook, Senator

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Zito, what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR ZITO:

Seated in the Democratic Gallery to the rear of the Chambers, I'm delighted to have the students and advisors from Jane Addams School which is located in my hometown in Melrose Park. I'd like the Senate to recognize their presence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Would the students please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Have a nice day. Senate Bill 648. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you. This is a controversial, yet a straight -straightforward proposal. And if you'll listen carefully, I think
it'll eliminate a lot of questions. All -- says -- Senate Bill 648
does, is provide that all the members of the -- State Board of
Education would be elected, rather than appointed. There would be
one additional - one member from each congressional district in
Illinois, and there would be -- that would be and two members
appointed by the Governor, two of those would be of a minority
status. One would be guaranteed a spot which would be a Hispanic.
There are a number of reasons why the board should be elected.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Again, it's a straight board - straightforth proposal. It's similar to the one that we afford with the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, you either like it, or you don't. I would solicit your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Senator from Cook, Senator Dudycz. SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand in opposition to Senate Bill 648 for several reasons. First of all, Illinois already has more elected — officials than any other state in the United States of America. And what Senator Demuzio is trying to do is to add twenty—three more that are elected, and then he wants to add two appointed. And we just debated the amendment on the appointee — that one of those appointed members must be a Hispanic, two must — two must be — minority members. You've not addressed whether one of those — whether women are — are included as minorities among the two. Also, the Illinois Constitution...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

In my house, they're the majority.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

...it provides for the election...pardon?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

In my house, they are the majority

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

...the Illinois -- the Illinois Constitution provides for the election or the appointment of the State Board of -- Education, not for both. So this is a -- a flawed bill, and I urge its defeat.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman from McLean, Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senator Demuzio, in your opening comments you said there are a number of reasons why we ought to elect the State Board, but you failed to say what those reasons were. I'm just curious. Why -- why - if it ain't broke, why do we want to fix it? That's a question, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

#### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator Maitland. I was trying to spare you. There's eight hundred bills on the Calendar. I would be more than happy to give you a -- an essay that have in front of me with all of the litany why I believe that they should be elected, and I'm prepared to do that. I was attempting to spare the Members of this Senate with the long lengthy debate. If you persist, I would be happy to -- to provide you with a list.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Maitland.

## SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I've served here for eleven years with you, and you've never spared those reasons when you had a real strong interest in something. And I really question why -- why you refuse - I just want to make the point.

PRESIDING OFFICER:

What's your point?

# SENATOR MAITLAND:

We -- we right now have a balanced State Board Education. As all of you know, they are picked by -- by the Governor. No -- no more than nine members can be from any one political party. They are geographically located around the State. It just seems to me that -- that the board, that as the Governor picks these individuals, he is picking someone who understands education.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Many of them have been former school board members, and they're people who really understand the wants and the needs, and the conditions in education. And it seems to me, it's just like Senator Demuzio, when we attempt to elect the Commerce Commission; we begin to have people running for special interest purposes. And I just don't think that's good. I think we ought to stick with what we have. It's serving us well. And I would urge defeat of Senate Bill 648.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio, to close.

#### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well. Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I happen to think that the elected process is perhaps the best process, Senator Dudycz. And I'm certainly not afraid to allow the voters of Illinois to determine who their elected officials should be. This elected school board would be much more accountable than the appointed process that we have now. And it seems to me that this approach is something that's been similar, and it's been working in other states. There's been a number of discussions, these days, about the actions of the — of the State's Board of Education, with respect to some of the policies that they have put forth recently. And this provides, Members of the Senate, and the elected — electorate another option, with respect to electing their members. And I would urge your support.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 648 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 16 Ayes, 38 Nays, 3 recorded as Present. This bill, having failed to receive the constitutional majority, is hereby declared lost. 649. Senator Demuzio. I'm sorry.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, Senator Philip. What purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank -- thank you Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I don't know if you're aware, but the Gentleman from Champaign County's birthday today. Stanley Weaver, we like to call him our friendly undertaker. He tells me that if I will drive up to his funeral home, and die in the funeral home, he'll give me a twenty-five dollar reduction. It's his birthday today. He's a hundred and six years old, so, let's all go out and have a drink on Stan Weaver tonight. Happy birthday, Stan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Happy birthday, Stan. Many more. Adeline, please don't sing. Senate Bill 649. No. Come on, please. What purpose - the Lady - Senator Geo-Karis do you seek recognition?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

It's a point of personal, and I don't know if you all notice it or not, but Stanley Weaver looks just like Humphrey Bogart.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Look out Stan. You're in trouble. Roll call. Move to reconsider. Senate Bill 649. Oh, yes sir. The Gentleman from DuPage, Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr... I don't think I'd go that far to say Humphrey Bogart -- maybe Dracula.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

We better get back to business. Senate Bill 649. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 649.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I don't think this is any where near controversial that last one. So, this will be a good birthday present for you, Stanley. Senate Bill 649 is a bill that was put forth because there were some problems that was -- existed in my district, and I think some other Member's district, as well, with the Illinois Elementary School Association, which would prohibit students from participating in school athletic programs, from competing in events outside the jurisdiction of the association. understanding now that the IESA is now currently rewriting their rules to provide for participation. And there may not be as much controversy with this legislation as -- as I had thought. So, in lieu of that fact, I would like to move the bill on over to the House. And if, in fact, they adopt their rules which would be, in fact, similar to rules adopted by the Illinois High School Association, then there would be no need for this legislation I am told. But I want to move it forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 649 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having -- received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 650. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 650.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. 650 also would have been on the Agreed Bill List, I am told, but we'll just fly it up the flag pole today. Senate Bill 650 establishes a program - evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of existing, and proposed, Farm Credit Programs administered by the Farm Development Authority. The evaluation would be conducted by the University of Illinois, the College of Agriculture, and I would ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate 650 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 653. Senator Berman. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 653.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. Mr. President. Senate Bill 653, and the next three bills, are merely vehicles that I'd like to pass over to the House. They address the Chicago School Reform. Nothing is in them. I'm not sure we're going to do anything with them, but just to keep the vehicles alive. I solicit your vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Kustra.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. May I ask the sponsor a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates that he'll yield.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Senator, I think that we are all interested in fine tuning, if that's what it takes, any of the Chicago School Reform Legislation of last year. On the other hand, I am sure you would agree, we want to be careful that we don't undo, along the way, what we spent so much time doing last year. May I get a statement from you on what you're intentions are, should these bills come back in some form that would take us backwards instead of forwards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you for the question. I think that my intentions are identical with yours. I do not wish to undermine, one iota, the intent of that reform package. The purpose of keeping these alive is, essentially, to allow the interim board to come on board - see if they have any recommendations that we ought to respond to between now and July 1st. If there isn't, probably nothing ought to be done, outside of addressing the idemnification bill which is still over in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. With that, I would urge adoption of the next four bills then.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman, do you seek leave to have the Senate Bill 653, 4, 5 and 6 on one roll call? Hearing no objections, Senate Bill -- this will be a vote on Senate Bill 653, 54, 55 and 56. Have --

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. Senate Bill -- 653, 654, 655 and 656, are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 657. Senator Berman. 657. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

#### SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a substantive bill that addresses Senate Bill 1840, which was the Chicago School Reform Bill. What this does - is to allow the elements of reform in the structure to move forward. And that the question regarding the funding of some of the requirements for mandates, that we built into that bill, are allowed to be taken into consideration, in relation to their funding, but not to undermine the -- the structural changes that we had in Senate Bill 1840. I'd be glad to respond to any questions and solicit your Aye vote.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 657 pass. in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. Voting is opened. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded Present. This bill, as having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Adams, Senator Donahue, what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

#### SENATOR DONAHUE:

We have a group from Quincy Junior High School, the eighth grade class. They are here from Quincy, and their chaperone -- a very dear friend, Janie Fisher.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Would they please stand and be recognized by the Senate. Welcome to Springfield. Page 30, top of Page 30, Senate Bill 658. Senator Berman. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

### SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. This is a response to some of the PTA groups -- other parent and advocacy groups in Chicago, where in schools they have a large -- a large responsive population. They felt that the limitation that's built into Senate Bill 1840, of six parents, two teachers, two community members and the principal, they ought to have the opportunity for that local school council, by its own vote, to expand, in a like ratio, the membership of that council. So this bill requires, upon a three-fifths vote, that the -- membership of that council could expand, but it still be in the ratio of six, two and two. Be glad to respond to any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady from Cook, Senator Netsch.

## SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. As co-sponsor, obviously I would like to speak strongly in favor of this. The impetus came from

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

actually a number of parts of the city, but most particularly from one of the groups with -- with whom I had worked very closely on school reform. And it certainly has relevance in the district that I represent, not just the legislative district, but the school district. There are some areas where there is enormous parent interest, and they really would like an an opportunity to get more of those parents involved. I think Senator Berman and I, and everyone agrees that it has - absolutely in no way does it negatively reflect on this school reform. And is not inconsistent therewith. So I would strongly urge a Yes vote, also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady from Cook, Senator Alexander.
SENATOR ALEXANDER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege. In the gallery on the Democratic side, are students from St. Kilian Eighth Grade Grammar School. They belong to Senator Brookins, but I'm introducing them to the Senate at this present time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Will the students please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Cook, Senator Kustra. SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do remember at that March hearing there were parents who testified that they had, in some of their schools, folks standing in line waiting to participate, and there weren't the slots in these local school councils. If -- if that's the case, I think we ought to give these parents an opportunity to do so. And of course, what we're really doing is giving the responsibility to the local school council, which is what we argue we ought to do across the State with our own local school boards. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman, to close.

SENATOR BERMAN:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

I just want to correct the record, Mr. President. The local school council, by a majority of it's vote, and the subdistrict council, by three-fifths vote. I misspoke in my opening remarks. I solicit an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 658 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 659. Out of the record. 663. Senator Dunn. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill will encourage defendants to pay their traffic fines, by giving the Secretary of State the authority to prohibit the renewal, or reissue, or reinstatement of driving privileges to those individuals who have not paid their fines.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Senator Hawkinson. SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates that he will.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator, sometimes what happens on the suspended license cases is that there will be a lifting of a suspension, or the time period will run out, but there's no notification that a suspension is — is lifted. In this particular case, I don't — I don't quarrel with the bill, but I wonder what happens in a situation where there's a suspension, the person goes in — pays the fine, for some reason there's a delay in the paperwork, and that person, having paid the fine, is thereafter picked up for driving on a suspended license. Is it the intent of this bill, or the reading of it, that that person would be guilty of the offense, even after paying the fine?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator Hawkinson, you're right. That is a problem, but that really isn't a problem that -- that is contained in this bill. That's -- that's a problem with the Secretary of State failing to notify the - you know, reinstating the individual on the computer. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

## SENATOR HAWKINSON:

But -- but in this case, you've got the additional problem of -- of notification by the -- by the clerks, and possible delay there. And it seems to me that this in an extraordinary remedy for - normally we're suspending licenses for drunk driving and -- and mutiple offenses. Here we're talking about it as a -- as a tool to collect fines, and -- and I don't quarrel with that. But I wonder if there can't be some -- some method of working on this more general problem that'll cause, at least in this type of situation, not to be a problem for our constituents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well, I'd be happy - if you have a better mousetrap, I'm happy to work with you. But this really deals with the notification of failure to pay fines, not of suspensions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The -- the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Barkhausen. The Lady from DuPage, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates that he will.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator, I was asked to handle a similar bill to this, and then the Secretary of State's Office came over and said they had been working with a sponsor from the House, and they had come up with an agreement. It was an agreed bill among all parties. Did -- did you take that amendment then, and put it on this bill -- the agreed amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

There is similar bill over in the House. I -- I gather it has passed over there. I don't know that there is any harm in passing it over here. And, apparently, the Secretary of State seems to - if this is the agreed amendment, has agreed to cooperate with the municipalities. Municipalities want this, so that they can collect fines. And I would vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, where is the Secretary of State on this issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

This -- this amendment, that I placed on my bill, is a by-product of an agreement between the Secretary of State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn, to close.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

I've made my point. I urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 6-6-3 pass? All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 53 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 6-6-5. Senator Dunn. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 665.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill will enact - penalties for firearm violations committed on public housing property. It

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

will enhance the offense from a Class 4 felony, to a Class 3 felony providing two to five years and up to ten thousand dollar fine. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, does an amendment define public housing in this bill? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

No, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

## SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Can you define public housing for me as it would be interpreted under this bill; or is that something you intend to do in the House?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

# SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well, I would -- I would give it it's common definition, and say that it would be housing that is provided by the government, and it charges a fee for residents to live in, but it's purely a government sponsored housing type project.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Raica.

## SENATOR RAICA:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

#### SENATOR RAICA:

Senator, currently what is the law regarding if -- if -- if weapons are used, say in playgrounds or anything, is that any more severe than this - is it the same as you're going to impose - less severe?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

#### SENATOR T. DUNN:

I have upgraded the -- the offense from a Class 4 to a Class 3, but I'm not aware of -- of playgrounds, by and in themselves, being singled out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Raica.

### SENATOR RAICA:

Why are we doing it just for the public housing and not for playgrounds, or parks, or anything else? I mean, there's just as many kids or anything around.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

The -- the Safe School Zone Act covered that two years ago, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Raica.

## SENATOR RAICA:

So there is something that covers that already?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn, to close.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you, Mr. President. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 665 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote nay. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Bond, Senator Watson, what purpose do you seek recognition?

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR WATSON:

SENATOR WATSON:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce a lady to you who, today, is receiving the Governor's unique achievement award. And the lady's name is Virginia Crabtree, she's from my district in Ramsey. She has with her, her two daughters and sisters. And this is an award that the Midland Area Agency on Aging has nominated Ms. Crabtree, and she's going to receive it for volunteer work -- for the hospital and the seniors in Vandalia and Fayette County, and the Ramsey area. So I'd like to welcome her to the Senate, and certainly hope that you would do the same. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Congratulations, Mrs. Crabtree. Senate Bill 6-6-6. Senator Dunn. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 6-6-6.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill addresses the problem of where a police officer on the street sees an individual whom he knows has violated the terms of his bond, or his probation. In order for the officer to do anything about that, he must go to the State's Attorney's Office, give the facts to an assistant, and file a petition to revoke either the bond or the probation. With this, in and by itself, will allow that officer to arrest that individual, and take him directly to jail for violation of his probation or bond.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 6-6-6 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 6-6-7. Senator Dunn. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill would require the confiscation of a firearm in the possession of a minor, while he's in the commission of an offense, for which he is ajudged delinquent - ajudicated delinquent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the bill, but would ask the sponsor to consider an amendment in the House which would track the options for disposal of weapons with existing law - criminal law for adult confiscation of weapons, found in Section 24-6 of the Code.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn, to close.

#### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you very much. Senator Hawkinson, I have no problem with that whatsoever. I urge an Aye - a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 6-6-7 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 6-6-8. Senator Dunn. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

#### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. It is an offense to unlawfully possess a firearm while in a motor vehicle. However, currently under the law, it is not an offense to discharge a firearm from a vehicle, and that's what this addresses. And this addresses the question of drive by shootings that have occurred, not only in my community, but in other communities throughout the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 6-6-8 pass? All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 670. Senator Dunn. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 670.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The prior bill addressed the question of firing from a motor vehicle. In other words, possibly sitting in the vehicle. This bill amends shooting of a weapon from inside the vehicle outside. I urge a...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill -- Yes, sir?

The Gentleman from Lake, Senator Barkhausen. Put your light on.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

I'm sorry, Senator Dunn. We're going awfully fast here. I just -- if the Gentleman will yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Senator Dunn, I know -- that -- that I was confused in your explanation just a moment ago. And I just want to make sure we're not doing anything that's going to be confusing to -- to a court or a jury. Tell us again what the difference is between this bill and the last one you presented?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

I'll be happy to, Senator. The prior bill prohibited the firing of a weapon from a motor vehicle. This bill would - prohibit the firing of a weapon from a inside of a vehicle -- outside - drive bys.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

I'm still not sure I see a difference. In the first instance, if you're firing a weapon from a vehicle are -- are -- are you not -- are you not firing it from inside the vehicle outside, as you described in your second instance?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well, I -- I suppose you could make that interpretation. But I wanted to make it clear and make a distinction between individuals who are sitting on a motor vehicle. In other words, outside of the vehicle and individuals who are sitting inside of a vehicle, and firing out. And that was why I made the distinction. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Would it maybe not make some sense to do it as -- as part of the same bill, rather than having two -- two separate bills and two separate penalties, and perhaps criminal charges for what may be, essentially, the same criminal act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

No, I don't think that we ought to. I think we ought to provide for all instances and this -- this is one that provides not only for a drive by situation, but individuals who are sitting on a vehicle, and firing at a vehicle that goes by.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Friedland.

### SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

## SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you. Senator, would this - I notice that there might be a sportman's club, or two, that have some questions about this legislation, and the previous bill. Might this interfere with the handicapped hunters in any way, or are they authorized, today, to shoot from vehicles? I know I would just make an inquiry on that, are wheelchair people -- handicapped...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn.

# SENATOR T. DUNN:

Being a hunter myself, Senator, I'm having a little bit of difficulty envisioning someone that's handicapped firing a weapon, for hunting purposes, out of a motor vehicle. I just - in all sincerity, I'm having trouble envisioning that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Dunn, to close. Senator Dunn, to close.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 670 pass. All in favor, vote

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to have to go back on Page 29, and just read into the record, Senate Bills 654, 5 and 6, which we passed on the one roll call. We didn't read the bills into the record. Mr. Clerk, read the bills. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 654.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Try title only, it's much faster.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 654.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 655.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Those bills received the constitutional majority, and --hereby are declared passed, by the roll call that was contained on Senate Bill 653. Back to Page 30, middle of the page. Senate Bill 673. Senator Welch. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you, Mr....

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me. The noise level is getting up to a little bit of a roar. Would you give the Gentleman your attention, please. Thank you. Please -- please -- Mr. -- Senator Welch.

## SENATOR WELCH:

This bill was the recommendation of the Citizens Assembly on Children. What it does, is it mandates DORS to conduct a study concerning the needs of hearing impaired and behavior disordered children in Illinois. The plan is to be finished by April 1 of 1990 for potential future legislation. I'd be glad to answer any questions, if they're any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 673 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 49 Ayes, 5 Nays, 1 recorded as Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 678. Senator Raica. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 678.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Raica.

#### SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What this is -- provides that if a hospital requires that a patient pay the hospital bill in full, or in part, for services rendered to the patient, pending the hospital's receipt of the payment for those services from an insurance company, or third

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

party payer; the hospital must reimburse the patient within fourteen days after it receives payment for services from the third party payer. This has been brought to light because a lot of constituents have paid hospitals and are waiting anywhere from sixty to ninety days for a payment that the hospitals were paid for - and had not paid in a timely manner. I'd ask for your favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 678 pass. in favor, vote Ave. All opposed, vote Nav. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please the record. On this question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, 1 having Present. This bill, recorded as received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 680. Senator Kelly. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 680 addresses the issue of school reorganization. This bill provides for a Supplemental State Aid reimbursement of eight thousand dollars per certified teacher each year for three years after the formation of a new school district. Had this bill been in effect over the last three years, the State cost would have been 3.4 million. The Senate has grappled with the issue of school reorganization for many years and considered many proposals. And it's very clear that forced consolidation is not desirable, or possible. This bill puts the State in a positive

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

light by offering those districts considering reorganization an incentive, and a carrot for - consolidating. And I ask - solicit your support. Be glad to answer any questions you might have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I -- I'm concerned, Senator Kelly, about what we are doing here. I was the Senate sponsor of the three measures that we have in place now to encourage school districts to consolidate. Those are all tied to -- something substantial as a result -- as it effects consolidation effort. This does -- this really does nothing but -- but bump -- but bump the salaries in that -- in that district with State money. And I'm concerned, first of all, about what happens at the end of the period. Where are we after the State no longer jumps in there and subsidizes those salaries of that new district? You know, what happens there? Secondly, I think when we're talking about consolidation, especially in a these smaller districts, there is greater efficiency - greater utilization of -- of teachers, and the like. And -- and this almost negates the effect of that by saying the salaries are going to go higher, subsidized by the State, and ignores the fact that the -- that the district now because it has consolidate -consolidated is a more efficient district. My question once again is, sir, what do we do with those - how do we deal with that issue after the -- after the money's gone?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Kelly.

## SENATOR KELLY:

Well, for one thing, it - if the schools consolidate, you and I know that - it - there is going to be a cost saving, and a lot of schools that are on this watch list, I think would come off, if

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

they had a consolidation. And in the long run, I think the State would be better served by the consolidation, and even though there's a eight thousand dollar incentive per teacher, it would, in effect, save the State more money in the long run.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, that -- that's fine, Senator, but that didn't answer the question. My point is, we are subsidizing those salaries to the tune of eight thousand dollars, is that not a true statement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Eight ~ eight thousand dollars over a three year period, yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Then what, all of a sudden, happens when -- when that three year period is gone, and -- and the money that subsidized those salaries is gone, as well? What's going to - what, all of sudden, happens that's going to allow the school districts then - the wherewithal to pay the salaries?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Kelly.

## SENATOR KELLY:

I'm sorry, would you please repeat that question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Wait a minute. Let's get a little... Senator Maitland, would you please repeat the question?

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, Senator, I don't have to. I -- I know the answer, and you know the answer. And the fact of the matter is, I support

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

incentives, I support consolidation, I think this is -- this is the right thing to do - to provide these incentives. If you want to really help the districts that are going to consolidate, why don't you adjust, or fine tune the measures that are already in place. And let's don't do it in an artificial way. This is not -- this is not the right way to go, and I -- I think the Body ought to oppose this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Kelly may close.

SENATOR KELLY:

Just ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 680 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 35, the Nays are 19, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 680, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 680 -- 681, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly, for a moment. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JONES:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR JONES:

I'd like the Senate to welcome the students from the Marcus

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Garvey Elementary School, they're with one of their teachers, and many other teachers, Mrs. Barsh -- also their Assistant Principal, Mr. Joseph Haley. But I would also like to announce that Mr. Haley, who is the Assistant Principal, is the Executive Director of the Jackie Robinson Little League, which will serve as the host for the Little League Championship games in the 17th District. Let's give them a warm welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized by the Senate. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Kelly, on 681. SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, for your support on the previous bill. Senate Bill 681 would allow school employees, who are not full time teachers, to be eligible for the ten six <sic> (sick) day benefit, if they are eligible to participate in a IMRF. Currently, some school boards have interpreted the provisions that certain clerical and custodial workers, who are working nine months a year, are not considered full time employees. This benefit would be extended to them. They certainly are full time in serving their district, and I think they deserve this consideration. And I solicit your support. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Bill -- 691 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 581, <sic> having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Senate Bill 684. On the Order of Senate Bill 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 684, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 684.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Take it out of the record. 686. Senator Kustra. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 686. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 686.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kustra.

### SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. As a reaction to some of the serious school incidents regarding harm, and in some cases death to students, and personnel on school grounds. There's been a concern expressed by a number of schools in the State that they be allowed to use their life safety taxing and bonding authorities for school security purposes. The State Board of Education issued a ruling that they could not do so. What this bill does is allow school districts to utilize their Life Safety Tax levy, which is up to five cents without referendum, and up to ten cents with referendum, to alter or reconstruct any school building, or to purchase and install security equipment under certain conditions. Again, the bill in no way changes anything in the law regarding the referendum provisions that are already in place. All it does is add to the list of how that tax might be used - security. I would ask for

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill. I think that this is a reasonable extension of the definition for the use of the Life Safety Tax. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 686 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 47, the Nays are 4, none - on that question, the Ayes are 48, the Nays are 3, none voting Present. Senate Bill 686, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Senate Bill 687. Page 31, 688. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, top of Page 31 is Senate Bill 688, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 688.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This, basically, would amend the Public Aid Code so that a -- a top quality nursing staff would be recognized by the Department of Public Aid as part of the Quip Program. Right now the Quip Program was designed, you know, to try to enhance, through incentives, better health care facilities - better health care in general. This would add one more qualification to their criteria.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

And I would seek your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 688 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 54, the Nays are 4, none voting Present. Senate Bill 688, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 692, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 692.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

#### SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Bill 692 provides a credit for qualified research and development expenses, as defined by the Internal Revenue Code. It does follow in line with the Federal R and D credit. What is important is that credit, at the federal level, is expiring on December 31st of this year. I think investment in research and development - not only has it declined from three percent of our GNP to two percent in our GNP in this last decade, but it really is the lacking ingredient, or the weak link, in trying to address the challenges of our economy. And at least - the information that I was provided last week - not only does our largest Caterpillar, but Staley, John Deere, Abbott, Fermi and ADM among others, support this legislation. I'll be happy to answer any questions, and would urge your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

All right. Discussion? Senator Rigney. SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well Mr. President, I think in all fairness, we ought to point out that this is a new program - one we've never had before. subject here is so-called qualified research expenses. My handlers tell me that the definition of research is rather broad in nature, and a lot of things might apply here that we have never even thought about. A few other things in here establishing also the carryback principle for three years and a carryforward for fifteen years. We don't do that, knowledge, anywhere else in our Tax Code. I realize that it's very difficult to vote against various Tax Credit Bills. on a cumulated nature, we, collectively, have introduced over three hundred million dollars of various tax give-aways, tax credits and so forth. This is just one of many. We don't know what we're going to have, as far as revenue is concerned. little difficult to talk about the subject of revenue, when you're talking in a vacuum. We don't know whether we're going to have new tax package, if we do, we don't know whether we're going to get any of it, or whether we're going to give all of it away. think it goes without saying we're going to give more to our schools, and some other social services around the State of Illinois. And for this reason, I think we ought to go a little slow on bills of this kind. Maybe not any worse than a dozen or so others that are pending here at the present time, but it's the sort of legislation, at least I feel at this time, I'm not going to be able to support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. It may come as a surprise to some of my colleagues to -- make it known that it was with my

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

suggestion that this bill was allowed out of committee. And I would like to explain why. I think of it, really, as an alternative to the investment tax credit. I have not been the greatest fan of an investment tax credit. And I think the recent figures would show that it is rather modestly used, in terms of the numbers of employers, perhaps is some justification for that position. One of the things that, clearly, this country has let itself fall behind with respect to, is research and development. And while the definition may be somewhat over broad in this case, at least it is -- it is aimed at research and development. And it occurred to me that the Legislature, partly because we were having adequate hearings in committee, Senator Rigney, since you weren't there to raise these questions, it seemed to me that -- it seemed to me that what we ought to have really is at least an opportunity for the Legislature to look at a research and development credit as a possible alternate to the Investment Now I'm fully aware of the fact that what you are likely to do is to end up passing them both, without making any And I can't, obviously, stop that from happening, but I think it is an alternative. I think it does make, in my judgment, probably greater sense than the Investment Tax Credit. And it is for reason that I think it is on the Calendar, and ought to be looked at seriously.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. For whatever that's worth. Further discussion? Senator Luft.

## SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in extremely strong support of Senate Bill 692, and I'd like to give you some reasons why. First and foremost, and I agree with Senator Netsch, that this is probably more important than the Investment Tax Credit that we have passed, which by the way, was my bill that did pass the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

And Senator Rigney, who has a similar bill, Senate. believe has a price tag on it of between fourteen and sixteen million dollars. A few years ago we were wise enough, Senate, to initiate a million dollar spin-off of the Exxon money to invest in research using ethanol and carbon monoxide to desulfurize coal. Now if that research is successful, we will wind up being able to use Illinois coal, satisfying the acid rain problem that the so high sulfer coal is causing. Use double the output of ethanol, and consequently the corn in the State of Illinois, and create somewhere up around fifteen hundred jobs. Secondly, in the city that Senator Hawkinson and I represent, the City of Peoria, the Northern Illinois Research Lab has set up, in conjunction with other people in our area, a consortium for the investment and research and development of products, one of which was developed - using corn base to create plastics. There nothing more important than the -- to the future than research and And I would strongly suggest that we pass this bill out of the Senate, give Senator Severns the -- the wherewithal proceed with negotiations with the administration, and, hopefully, come to a conclusion. And, by the way, if you will remember, the Governor himself, I think, initiated, or is attempting to initiate -- initiate, a twenty million dollar appropriation for research and development. So that should be some indication to those of us in the Legislature, the importance of research and development. And I would seriously hope that we support Senator Severns' bill. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Severns, may close. SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Without belaboring the point, I would like to just address a couple of concerns raised by Senator Rigney. First, the definition of -- qualified research is taken exactly from the federal language as

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

is written. So I don't think it's a casual - it was not a casual approach, or a approach without thought. We used federal definition. And finally, I think we've taken a responsible approach on -- on this R and D Tax Credit. I've put -- I've entered into this bill sunset legislation; where in five years this credit will expire. If it deserves to be approved I'm sure it will be, but it does have sunset legislation worked in to it. I don't think there's a one of us who company in our district who wouldn't say, in research and development lies many of the answers to our economic challenges. And for that reason, and more, I would urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill -- Senate 692 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 41, the Nays are 13, none voting Present. Senate Bill 692, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 695, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 695.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpiel.

### SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 695 authorizes the Department of Corrections to convey, by quitclaim deed, to Kane -- County a parcel of land that contains 42.86 acres, in exchange for one million seventeen thousand dollars. This property lies adjacent to the St. Charles

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Juvenile Detention Center, and it is going to be used by Kane County as the new Criminal Courts Complex. Appraisals have been done. This has been agreed to by the Department, and by Kane County. I know of no opposition. I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 695 pass? Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate 695, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 696, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill, please. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 696.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

# SENATOR JACOBS:

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

This - Senate Bill 696 is a simple bill. It just makes it to where all townships will have the same qualifications, rather than to split it above fifteen thousand and below fifteen thousand. Be happy to answer any questions.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 696 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 53, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 696, having received the required

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Senate Bill 697. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 697.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 697 authorizes the local community college board to levy an additional tax upon real property for educational and building purposes. The maximum is that amount bringing the local levy up to the Statewide average levy. We passed a similar legislation last year for South Suburban. We're asking that this be done for our junior colleges, because most of those areas where junior colleges are located, the tax -- base is eroded. I know in my community it's eroded by twenty-five percent, and I'd just ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Jacobs, is this a frontdoor or a backdoor referendum? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It's a backdoor.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield...

SENATOR HALL:

Senator Jacobs, I'm in the process of putting a tax on a district now that's as -- the assessed valuation has dropped from three hundred and eighty million to thirty-eight million dollars. That's a three hundred million drop, so now, what effect would that have on a district if they could do this? In very poor districts like I'm talking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, is that a junior college district, you're in reference to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

That's exactly what I'm talking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

What is the name of the -- the college? I might be able to help you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

It's going to be a State community college.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Is it Belleville?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

It -- it's the former experimental college that -- is East St. Louis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'm sorry. I've got most of those that it would cover, and for some reason I don't have that one. I have Blackhawk, South Suburban, Lakeland, Carl Sandburg, Kankakee, Belleville and John Wood Community College. So, evidently -- is this a new college that will be starting up, or is it one that's already currently in?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

It's the experimental college that was there for -- for -- and now it's going into -- eventually it will go into that. I'm just wanting to know. It may end up into the Belleville area college, but I'm just saying that the -- this is additional cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Currently -- currently, Senator, under this bill, you would not be -- be covered. However, when you become a junior college, you get into it. It very well may be that you would be automatically included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

All right. Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, the backdoor referendum - I've forgotten how many signatures would be required in order to put that referendum to a vote. Can you tell me?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

No, I cannot, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I noticed that there are two college districts that are a part of my Senate district, on of them is the one is which you live, Blackhawk College, and I know that voters there have -- have rejected referendums, I think twice in recent years. I'm not sure about Carl Sandburg, but as I understand what you're doing here, those college districts would be able to raise local property taxes to some Statewide average, unless enough of the voters called for a referendum. Is that, in essence of what you're doing here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Correct. And it's my understanding that's ten percent, Senator. Ten percent of the voters in that district. And let me add one thing, that -- just to correct the record, Blackhawk College, did, in fact, pass a -- a tax referendum, but by the time

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

the tax come into effect with the erosion of the tax base, that increase became a six percent net loss.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

### SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. There are only a few occasions which citizens can express their outrage at a tax increase, and that is in the school referendum and the community college Both of those generally have great difficulty in referendum. passing. However, the community college referendum is even more difficult, because there are far less students from a district that go to school in those community colleges. Normally, the levy for the community college is extremely small, but the fact is that it is a tax, and they are asking for a tax increase. Therefore, the people generally vote No. South Suburban College, which is listed on this, had, for many years, the lowest tax rate in State of Illinois. And what this basically does, and with some commitment on the part of the General Assembly to force a tax, to try to bring up some of these districts to where the amount of money per a study period or study hour is close to what it across the State. I'm not real pleased with -- with this kind of tactic, but I don't see any alternative, particularly in the fact that the community colleges have been the backbone recently of educating the people in our communities to do skilled work and other types of educational programs that are not available in colleges.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Zito.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR ZITO:

Senator Jacobs, I apologize for getting involved in the conversation a little bit late, but am I to understand correctly that what this will do is bring approximately thirty community colleges up to the average State levy? We taking all the community college districts, and then allowing them the opportunity to raise to that average?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It is my understanding there's only six in this provision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

There's only six community colleges that would increase a levy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

That the Illinois College Board has certified. It does have to be certified, I might add, and must obtain approval of the State Board before they can apply. So these are the only six that have been certified.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Are you aware that -- is -- are you aware of Triton Community College's effect? Will that be inclusive or exclusive in the levy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Exclusive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Will this provide for the Board to impose this levy, or are we now giving authorization if we pass Senate Bill 697, we will automatically give them the power to levy?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

No -- as I indicated, Senator, the Board must obtain the State Board of Education's approval and it must be approved by the State Board. The Community College Board, yes.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

As I read, Senator Jacobs -- Senator Jacobs, as I read my analysis, this has an interesting effect. It isn't simply raising these colleges to Statewide average, it raises the Statewide average, so in reality you've a double-ratchet effect. Number one, they come up, then by bringing up the bottom, you brought up the Statewide average, which will let them do it again or others do it, or whatever. Am I misreading this?

END OF TAPE

TAPE 5

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

No. Senator, for these colleges that would not happen. What we did with South Suburban last year would, of course, have an effect on that average. As these would come on board, it's most certainly correct that that would have that cumulative effect if someone were to do it in the future, yes.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Jacobs, may close.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, I'd just ask for a favorable vote, and just make mention that this bill will cost approximately -- the most it'll raise is three million two hundred and fifty-three thousand Statewide.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 697 pass? Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, on that question there are 30 Ayes, 21 Nays, and 6 voting Present. Senate Bill 6-9-7, having received the required constitutional vote, is declared passed. Senator Dudycz, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

State you point, sir.

# SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this afternoon we have the second group of senior citizens from my district. They are also

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

known as the Checkerboards. They are a variety club, and they're being chaperoned by Cecila Krys and Rose Ann Szech. I'd like to have them recognized, please.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Holmberg. 698. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 698. Middle of Page 31, Ladies and Gentlemen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 698.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg.

### SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 698 is a recommendation of the Illinois Primary Health Care Association. This organization represents approximately twenty-five community health centers Statewide, that provide services to persons with limited incomes, public aid recipients, and unemployed persons. They also service areas with physician shortages, such as southern Illinois. What they're basically asking for in this bill, is a requirement that the Department of Public Health establish a program to expand access to comprehensive primary care in medically underserved areas. Grants that might be forthcoming from such a program, would be allocated to community health centers eligible under Department rules. The Department of Public Health is in support of this program. I know of no opposition.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 698 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 698, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Carroll, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR CARROLL:

On a point of personal privilege, if I might, Mr. President. PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, sir.

### SENATOR CARROLL:

I'd like to welcome to the Senate, the Mayor from my district, the Mayor of Lincolnwood, Frank Chulay.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Mr. Mayor, welcome to Springfield. Senator Berman. 699. 700. 701, was on the Recall, Senator Smith. 702. Senator Smith. 03. 04. 05. Bottom of Page 31. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 705, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 705.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 705 is a health provide care. It includes -- including physicians that they shall furnish HIV testing during the course of prenatal services. The AIDS Confidentiality Act covers the testing. Senate Bill 705, which is modeled after current laws, in Rhode Island and other states, attempts to prevent the spread of AIDS in newborns and children. Those of

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

you, if you listened to television documentation, it was at -saw about the tiniest babies, and it gave the April 23, information that some children acquire the AIDS infection from a blood transfusion. But most children acquire the HIV infection while still in the mother's womb. The children's mothers were members of high risk groups, who carried the virus, which was transmitted to the newborn child during her pregnancy, or birth. Most women discover that they are carriers of HIV viruses after the child develops the disease. And frequently, carriers do not have symptoms of the disease. Though blacks composed only percent, and Hispanics seven percent of population, studies show that seventy-three percent of women nine -- 79.9 percent of children with AIDS are black, or Hispanic. Nearly all the mothers use drugs, or were the sex partners of drug addicts. As of February 1989, thirty-three cases of children with AIDS had been reported in Illinois. However, this figure is climbing. These children are frequently abandoned in hospitals, and are commonly known as boarder babies. Child victims of AIDS are often under the jurisdiction of the Department of Children and Family Services; and they are hard to place in foster care. for that particular reason, the Department of Children and Family Services has a pamphlet out, where they're soliciting people would volunteer to help them. There is no fiscal note on this, and the Department of Health is in the accord with this bill. And I ask for your favor <sic> vote. If you have any questions, be delighted to answer.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Is there any discussion? Senator Topinka.

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

If I may ask - two questions to the sponsor.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

First of all, are psychologists allowed to do this testing? PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

No, darling.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Have you amended psychologists out of the bill in some capacity. Because the bill originally required psychologists to offer that test. And it was my understanding that they're not allowed to do such testing? Are they amended out?

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

## SENATOR SMITH:

I'm sorry, but it was never in the bill.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

That's what my analysis says, and it makes quite a point of it. So, I mean, I just bring that to your attention, because if it's still there, you might want to maybe, assuming this gets out of here, that maybe that be looked at in the — in the House. Second thing is, where is the Illinois State Medical Society on this bill?

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

The Illinois Medical Society -- Medical Society have not taken any position, whatsoever. And neither have they contacted me during the entire time I've had this bill entered.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates she will yield. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

If you're going to mandate this testing, does the State Mandate's Act kick in, and does the State have to pick up the cost of this AIDS virus test that's going to be mandated?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Senator Davidson. Ιt is not mandated. No. Τ÷ is volunteering, so much so that the Department of Children and Family Services are asking people if they would volunteer for - if I might read this to you. The Department of Children and Family Services is looking for special-care-experienced foster parents, who enjoy caring for babies, interested in developing special skills, working as part of a professional team, for special children who are positive for the AIDS virus. Ages birth to three years of age. Health ranging from no apparent symptoms to symptoms - AIDS. Special training would be provided on universal infection control, facts about AIDS virus, transmission of the course, disease, et cetera. And - so, the tests - all of this is volunteer.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well - says here that test is required by every physician, nurse, psychologists, hospital, or other health care facility who's offering testing for HIV to anyone receiving prenatal or

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

family planning service, unless it's deemed inappropriate. You're mandating - demanding that any person who takes care of a lady, who is either in prenatal care, or family planning, that this test must be done unless they deem it inappropriate. So you're laying the person wide open if they don't demand it, the person's going to sue under the Malpractice Insurance to that person that's saying, "Well you didn't demand it, and I had it." Now that's a lot of baloney. Now, we either mandate it, and the bill says they "will" offer this test. I think this is awfully wrong if you're trying to accomplish something to help people in prenatal care. This isn't the way to do it. I don't think this is a very good because you're demanding that we who are in the health care field, and thank goodness I don't take care of pregnant women, but all the people who do, that they have to offer the test. they deem it inappropriate not to offer the test, and if the person comes up with it, then they're liable for a malpractice suit that won't stop. This is not a good idea.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Hudson.

# SENATOR HUDSON:

Would the sponsor yield?

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

# SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senator Smith I'm -- I'm -- I wish that you would clarify me, a bit, on a point here. If a women is examined, this is prenatal - this is - and she is found to be caring AIDS -- right? That's what the test shows, she has it. She's carrying a -- an infant in her womb, but does this discovery, that she has AIDS, make her, according to your previous bill, which you did not call, make her, then, a disabled person if your previous bill, 704, were to pass? Would

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

this pregnant mother be then considered a disabled person?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. Senator Hudson, AIDS victims are already considered as a disabled person. I can't hear you. I can't hear you. I ... (machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator -- Senator Hudson. Senator Hudson.

### SENATOR HUDSON:

Then it would not be your intention to call your previous bill, which says that they would be declared disabled persons - entitled to the provisions of the -- of State services?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

I'm not calling that bill today, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hudson.

# SENATOR HUDSON:

...(machine cutoff)... calling the bill maybe tomorrow, or the next day, or some time in the future?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

If and when, you'll know. Yes, sir. We plan to. We plan to call that bill, but I was not ready for it today. But I -- I -- what I would like to get your cooperation on, is on Senate Bill 705 today. And I'd like to say to Senator Davidson, if you may, that we will take care of that which you are talking about, and are doubtful, in amendment over in the House. If you -- is that alright?

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hudson.

### SENATOR HUDSON:

Well. I reluctantly, Senator, I -- I think, find myself in a position where I don't feel I can support this, considering other bills that are pending that relate to this situation. Because if the mother is found, and is judged to be, disabled and therefore, entitled to the services of this State, that's -- that's another question. We're getting into another area entirely, its seems to me, and with other implications. And also, I'm wondering if she is found to be a disabled person, if then, perhaps, an abortion wouldn't be the easiest way out for that mother. I don't know whether that would be recommended or not, but it certainly is a possibility. I just have some serious questions about the down the road implications of your bill, Margaret, and I'm sorry about it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

# SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Can I ask the sponsor a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

# SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Smith, in -- in the way that the bill is -- is written, it states here that it will provide for testing of the HIV to anyone who is receiving prenatal, or family planning services. Could -- could this mean -- or if -- if the women who is -- is pregnant is -- is -- is found to have AIDS, what would be the position then are we -- this just seems like it's opening the gates to -- to -- to abortion, quite frankly. And I don't know if -- if that's the way that -- that we should go in this particular

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

piece of proposed legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. Senator Raica, to answer your question. Family planning has been removed from the bill. We had an amendment, if you'll notice on your legislation. It has been removed. So, what we are trying to do, we are trying to help little babies. We're trying to save, we're trying to prevent. That's what we are trying to do. Not complications. We are trying to prevent these babies, and -- with their parents, from coming into the world bringing AIDS and all of these different viruses that we're being plagued with today. That's what we are trying to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RACIA:

Senator Smith -- Madam President, the key word there was prevent. If we're saying prevent before the child is conceived, then that would be as far I'm concerned, prevention. But when you use the word prevent after the child is conceived, I think we're looking at abortion in that particular state, and for that particular reason I'm asking everyone to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will the -- will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Smith, I -- I have the bill now, and under Section 2 it says "definitions health care provider means a physician, nurse -- nurse, psychologists, hospital or other health care facility."

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Who is - could you tell me what the health care facility, I mean, what is -- what other health care facility are you -- are you talking about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. Senator Fawell, that was inadvertently placed into the legislation, and we had that taken out. So, that's not in. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

No, no you had -- family planning taken out. I've -- I've got the amendment. Did you put another amendment on, saying - taking out health care facility? Because I've got the only amendment that you put on. And all you deleted is "or family planning."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. Senator Fawell, I just stated to Senator Davidson that we're going to take that out of the legislation in the House. And there will be other changes made.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I'm reading this legislation the same as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Senator Smith had indicated that she wants to prevent children from coming into this world with AIDS. Well, the only way you can prevent them, is to abort them. Unfortunately, when a child is infected, and I am glad you're using the term children or child for an unborn person, because that's exactly what we're talking about before a baby is born. They are a child.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

And it seems to me that this, in fact, would increase the incident of abortion, and that there's just - we should take care of - if we find out a child had AIDS, we should -- provide some programs, some help for the family and for that child. But there is no way in the world you can prevent a child from coming into the world unless you abort them. And I oppose this measure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

President. There we go. Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I, pardon me for speaking a second time, but I do have the legislation now, and when we spoke earlier you did mention "psychologists" was not in the bill, it is on line 62 of the second page. Apparently, it has not been amended out. Psychologists are not allowed, by law, to do any kind of invasive work here - that includes blood test. I would recommend, you know, that you might want to put this on the Recall List, and attempt to clean this bill up. Because any other way, I think, you know, it's going to have some difficulty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

May I take this out of the -- record, because this is not a -- an abortion bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Take it out of the record.

# SENATOR SMITH:

And they seem to want to make this an abortion bill, and it is not a abortion bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Yes. Take the bill out of the record. Senator Smith. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 705. Senator Smith. 707. Read

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

the -- not 707. 709. Senator Smith. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 709. Read the bill, Madam President.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 709.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 709 amends the Unified Code of Corrections, regarding adult female. The Department of Corrections shall transmit to the Governor and the General Assembly, by January 1, 1990 and '91, and every two years thereafter, a planning document, detailing how the Department plans to meet the housing and programs needs of the adult-female offenders. Senate Bill 709 is a recommendation of the Citizens Assembly on Women. The intent of the bill is to acknowledge that pro-active planning for adult-female offenders is essential, if the State is to be prepared to meet the housing and program challenges of these — for these inmates. Currently...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Pardon me, Senator Smith. Will the -- will the Members please give her the courtesy of -- having her bill heard. Will you please take your conferences off of the Floor? Senators.

# SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith. ... (Machine cutoff)... Senator Smith.

### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam President. Currently, women comprised of 4.3 percent, which is nine hundred and two, of the State's adult inmate population. Eighty-eight percent are housed at Dwight and

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Logan - or Logan. And the remaining hundred and five are in the -- Houston Settlement in Chicago. Peoria women are -- are -located at the institution there -- Crossroads in Chicago, Community Correction Program, that's where these people housed. The Department of Corrections estimates that the State adult female offender population will reach crisis level by 1990, due to high numbers of women involved in crimes, especially drug related crime. Under the current situation, these inmates would have to be absorbed by Dwight, with a capacity of four hundred and ninety six, and a seventy-two bed female unit at Logan. 1985 Dwight's population has grown by twenty-seven percent. suit is pending against the Department of Corrections, concerning overcrowding conditions at Dwight. High versus Lane in 1986, lawsuit alleges that the following violations of Dwight inmate's constitutional rights exists, and that is, the lack of parity between the educational and vocational program offered for male and female adult inmates, the gendered base pay inequities -presented in the inmates pay scale, the co-mingling and minimum security women inmates and those of medium and maximum security status, and the transfer of women inmates near released to county jails where they are denied educational, vocational, and work opportunities. Neighboring states, such as Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Kentucky have lawsuits -- lost -- lawsuits similar to High and Lane have, and been forced to undertake programs unification. Organizations representing women support this bill in toto. The Department of -- of Corrections shall devise a five-year housing and program planning for women offenders. And all I ask, I'd like for your support in this, because it is sorely The overcrowdedness of our women, in these institutions, which is not good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Macdonald.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of this bill. Everything that Senator Smith read, certainly has been reflected over the years in testimony that has been given over and over and over again to the Council on Women. I would recommend an Aye vote on this vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

No further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 709 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 13 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 709, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 710. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 710.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Demuzio.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 710 is a bill that would require the Electoral Board to review the actual number of signatures on nominating and referendum petitions, to determine if the requisite number is - has been met. If not, the Electoral Board shall rule such petitions to be invalid. And it will also requires the petitions to be bound in a single book. Under the current law, as you well know, the Electoral Board has no power at all to --invalidate a nominating or referendum petition, even if they clearly lack the requisite number of -- signatures, unless an

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

objection is filed by a registered voter of the election understanding that the jurisdiction. It's my State Board of Elections has proposed rules authorizing the board to examine all nominating petitions to determine conformity with law. The rules that are being -- promulgated now would allow the board to reject petitions for nonconformity, subject to an appeal before the Electoral Board. And since these rules go beyond the scope of. excuse me, Senate Bill 710, it indicates that the board actually is moving in -- in this direction. So, all it would do would to afford them the opportunity to - require them to -- to look at the requisite number of signatures, and determine whether or not the requisite number of signatures has been bet on nominating or referendum petitions; and I would ask your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

According to our analysis, they have to be filed in a single book. Now, you know, you and I aren't going to have any problem. But what about these Statewide candidates? Are you saying that they have to file their's in a single book?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Demuzio.

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

We are saying in a single binder -- binder, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

I -- I may be wrong, but my understanding is, you got a lot of

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

petitions. I mean, are you going to -- you know, I'm just - it's
a point of information, it that feasible, that's all I'm asking?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

If no other discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 710 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 710 is declared passed. Senate Bill 716 was on the Recall List. Senate Bill 719. Senator Netsch. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 719 is the Computer Software Tax, although it really is not accurate to call it a tax. What we are doing is filling a gap in the definition of what is covered by our existing Sales Tax Law. Due to a court decision of several years ago, 1981 to be exact, the Illinois Supreme Court had held that under the laws that then existed, computer software as represented in that lawsuit, was intangible, rather than tangible personal property, and therefore, was not subject to our — actually to the Use Tax, which was the particular Statute involved in that case. I think that that was probably not a

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

totally realistic decision then, although perhaps fairer Since then, I think it has made no sense at all. As we have become more accustomed to all of the forms of computer software. At this point in time, Illinois is the only state with a State Sales Tax which does not cover computer software. So that we are not, in any way, putting ourselves in a noncompetitive position with other states, if we plug this loophole. I would also point out that the Department of Revenue is supporting Senate Bill 719, and indeed, testified in favor of it at the time of the Revenue Committee hearing. I would be happy to answer any questions. not, I would strongly urge your support. I think it have passed your notice, that virtually everyone in the Illinois General Assembly, both houses, who is proposing a slightly program, is looking to the plugging of this loophole, that is the Computer Software Tax, to fund that program. So, that if any of you are interested in downstate civic centers, or affordable housing, or any one of a half dozen other programs, you will be hoping that we have a computer software, so that you have a source new funding for those programs. Again, I would be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I think that's precisely the point, Madam President. I don't have any difficulty, either, in voting for a Computer Software Tax, as long as I know that it's going to wastewater treatment projects in Illinois. And I think that until such time as we, you know, make that decision, it seems to me that perhaps we ought to — perhaps we ought to keep this bill right on the Calendar, until such time as we make that decision, because I'm not prepared this morning, or this afternoon, or whatever it is now, to vote today, not knowing precisely where this twenty-four million dollars of

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

additional new revenue, that's to be generated, is going to go. And I'm not too sure, but I don't have my crystal ball, but I look over there, and I see Jack Schaffer, and I don't think that he's too excited about the Computer Software Tax being just out there drifting by its lonesome, until we attach it to something.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Rigney.

### SENATOR RIGNEY:

A question of the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield. Senator Netsch. Senator Netsch, a question for you, please.

# SENATOR RIGNEY:

Do you also have this on Senate Bill 392?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

I'm -- oh, that is the IRAPP bill. I'm not the principal sponsor of that bill, that's why I had to -- to - I would - paused a moment. Yes, I believe the last time I heard, it was on that and I think it is also floating on maybe several other bills, including some that are still over in the House. And I would - to further answer your question, if I might, Senator Rigney, I think we really have reached a point where there is no massive opposition to the idea of plugging this gap in the sales tax. That is, providing for a Computer Software Tax. I think the question of where it is going to end up, is still at least subject negotiation. And there certainly are several including the wastewater which Senator Demuzio mentioned, the downstate civic centers, IRAPP, and others that are looking to it. My feeling is that in order to make sure that everything doesn't get lost, because of that competitiveness among the several

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

proposed uses at the moment, that we make sure that there is at least one clean computer software moving through. And then it will either be attached to a particular program - dedicated to it, or everyone will sit down and divide up the pie on June 30th. But that's the reason why I think this is important. The specific answer to your question is yes, I believe that is still on 392.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jacobs.

# SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I couldn't agree more with Senator Netsch. We should get a clean bill out. This bill has been - these monies have been dedicated to about three or four different locations. We'll have the opportunity to vote each one up or down. So, I think that this bill should be taken through clean - as is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

## SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, unlike my colleague from Carlinville, I have total faith in Senator Netsch. And -- I'm sure if this bill passes that those are the same processes that would probably go through, to decide where that revenue goes, will still be underway, and I see no reason - frankly, I can't think of anyone I have more confidence to serve as the sponsor for this bill, which could quickly become the sponsor of the bill for every major tax increase this Session. And I do agree though, that the bill should go out in a clean fashion, and I'm sure in the final hours of the General Assembly a decision will be made. It's, I think, one revenue enhancer, if you will, that I think most of us can agree on, and my guess as to exactly how the revenue is spent, will be hammered out, and we'll all have a chance to vote on that a little later.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 719 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 20 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 719 is declared passed. Senate Bill 721. Senator Lechowicz. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 721.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 721 is exactly as stated in the synopsis. It expands the advisory, consultative and educational services which the Illinois Housing Development Authority, may provide to certain non-profit and limited-profit entities. That's the extent of the bill. And I seek your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Netsch. Can we have some order, please. Senator Lechowicz. Any -- any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 721 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 721 is declared passed. Senate Bill 722. Senator Lechowicz. Read the bill, Mr. - Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 722.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Lechowicz.

### SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 722 defines the definition of Residential Mortgage - applies to mortgage secured by liens on real property improved by both single unit and multi-unit residential structures, as contained within the IHDA Act. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 722 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. All who voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having the received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 722 is declared passed. Senator 724. Senator O'Daniel. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 724.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

# SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 724 prohibits the Department of Transportation from requiring the erection of an advertising sign within a specified period following issuance of a permit. It also prohibits the Department of Transportation from adopting a rule requiring a permittee to bear the cost of

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

recording a hearing held following the issuance of the Department of Transportation Notice to intend to revoke a permit. This is a JCAR bill, and the -- the JCAR feels that really the Department of Transportation doesn't have the -- statutory authority to impose these requirements. And I would attempt to answer any questions, if not, I move for the passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

I'm -- I'm trying to figure out, you know, what this bill does. It -- it frankly, it doesn't sound like it's a very good bill to me. What you're actually going to end up doing is limiting any competition you've got from -- from a smaller company. I mean, the big companies already have got their signs up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator -- Senator O'Daniel. Is a that question, Senator Fawell? Senator O'Daniel.

# SENATOR O'DANIEL:

I think that's probably a statement, but I think that's a over reaction from the Department of -- of -- of Transportation. They say, you know, that actually a permit costs five dollars, but that's just for the permit, but also they have to buy the right from the landowner and things of this nature. And really the department, JCAR doesn't think to have the statutory authority to do this, and if they want to do this, then there needs to be legislation to give them authority to do these things.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you, Madam President. I like to answer the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates that he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, the proverbial question is who wants this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Senator Watson, for sure Senator Jones does, he's Co-chairman of JCAR. JCAR gave me this bill, and they felt -- as I say, they felt that the Department of -- Transportation didn't really have the authority to -- to -- to request - require these -- these requirements. And if they want to do this, then there needs to be legislation to give them that authority. They don't have the authority JCAR feels to implement these kind of rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Watson.

# SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Well, it - I'll have to follow along with what Senator Fawell was talking about. It just -- it seems as though what we're doing here is right now, the provision is that if a sign company comes in, they lease the area and get the permit, that they have a hundred and eighty days in which to erect that sign. That's the way it is right now. What you're saying is that this isn't - we're taking out that provision and no longer requiring the sign to be built within that one hundred eight day period. What it seems to me then what is happening or what could happen is that the large sign companies, or someone who wants to come in and lease up all this - the -- the hot spots could do so without having to erect a billboard or a sign within that hundred and eighty days. That to me looks though - as though, we're

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

limiting the competition and really maybe knocking out the little guy. Now, if I'm wrong on that, you address that, but that just seems to me what we're doing here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jones.

### SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Madam Chairman. What the legislation does is this, is prohibit the Department from issuing that time restraint. If DOT wishes to have this time restraint — restraints which they do not have statutory authority to do so, all they would have to do is to put in necessary legislation. But JCAR, right now, they want to promulgate rules and to implement this law. If they want to write laws and so forth, maybe some of them should run for the Legislature, but they do not have statutory authority to issue such a rule. So what this bills does, is prohibit them from doing such, and if they so desire seek legislation giving them statutory authority to accomplish what your were talking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Donahue. Senator Donahue. SENATOR DONAHUE:

Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you said, Senator Dunn. Sorry, sorry. Question of the sponsor or co-sponsor, whichever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates that he will yield.

### SENATOR DONAHUE:

Having served on JCAR and serving on JCAR presently, you are as -- as JCAR is sponsoring a bill that says that prohibits the Department from doing something they feel they have the statutory authority to do. Why is -- why is JCAR putting in this bill in this form instead of making it pro -- pro-active and be able to allow the Department to do this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator O'Daniel.

## SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Senator Donahue, my feeling is that you know as well as I what the responsibility of JCAR is. We're suppose to monitor the different departments and see that that they do not overstep their authority, or over exert their authority that JCAR feels and — and Bruce Johnson and them, that the Department of Transportation doesn't have this authority. If they want it, all they have to do is to introduce legislation. But I think, you know, this is our responsibility is to monitor them and see that they don't over step their authority and to carry out their responsibility, so that's where I am on this — this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Donahue.

# SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, without going into great depth, we've had an ongoing discussion about this in JCAR, and I have a great deal of concern about it. I have felt that this legislation is not appropriate and something that is out of the jurisdiction of what JCAR is all about. I would oppose this legislation and hope that we can defeat it. This is the wrong way to go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Hall. Senator Kenny Hall. SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. President and Members of the Senate. While serving on JCAR, the -- the thing that I always found, that all these departments want to do things without authorization. And Senator Jones and the others who serve on it are absolutely right. We're the legislators, not them. They do not want to and there consistently told, if you want this, have a legislator introduce a bill. If you don't that, then you run for the legislature and do it. The big pint is, if you allow these

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

departments to come in here and take the job of legislators and say, "Well, we feel we got that right." Well, then say, "Why have you got the right, show us the legislation." That's what this bill - that's the essential thing that I see. And I'm supporter of this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

# SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of I also am a member of JCAR. The purpose of JCAR is to serve as a oversight committee which -- it has an oversight capacity over the departments and agencies of state government to ensure that they - the departments are fulfilling their statutory requirements in putting a program or a service, or something into They have a recommendation power. They can recommend to a department to say you are doing this wrong, or they can recommend to a department that they do something differently, or not do something at all. They have absolutely no power to stop the department from doing what they are doing. By putting legislation like this, they are expanding there own powers, maybe some one should be over seeing JCAR, because by putting in legislation like this, there doing more than recommending to Department of Transportation that they shouldn't be handling this situation in this way. They are, in fact, legislating that Department of Transportation do something differently. And that's entirely different thing than just being simply oversight. opposed to this bill as I was before the bill that I had last week about the Lottery. The Lottery was trying to put into place suggestions and recommendations of JCAR, and JCAR was opposed to the legislation. Now they are coming and telling us that Transportation is doing something that they Department of shouldn't be doing. Instead of letting the department put

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

legislation to change it if they wish, there going to do it by legislation. It seems to me that they are going a little bit further than they should be under their own guidelines. I oppose this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jones, for the second time.

# SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. You know I -- I -- I, as Co-Chair of JCAR, I am really shock at the remarks of some of my colleagues, who sit there -- who sat there in committee and -- and reviewed these suggested legislation relate to the JCAR proposed bills. This is nothing new. the Department of Transportation was in there. We objected to the rules that they were promulgating as relate to the signs and and and time restraints. Now the Department place Transportation says in other words, the heck with you, we're going to go ahead and do it irregardless of what you say. Now, this is a bi-partisan committee. And I see representatives from the Department of Transportation lobbying against the bill. What they should do -- what they should do is join in and even be supportive or put in the necessary -- legislation to give them the statutory authority to do what they want to do. But they don't want to do that. They want to do it by rule. And we objected to the rule. This is a bi-partisan bill, and I wish you, Senator Donahue and you, Senator Karpiel, who are both members of JCAR, you have objected to that at that time when the legislation was -- was proposed. But to come on the Senate FLoor and listen to what the department is telling you to do because they want to write laws themselves, I don't think that's in the best interest of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, and I --I support the Gentleman's motion for a -- for a Yes vote on Senate Bill 724.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator O'Daniel, looks like everybody that's speaking on this bill is a member of JCAR, and we are somewhat divided on that. But a question a prohibition of the erecting a sign within a specific time limit, can you tell me how this - how the Federal quidelines are impacted if this bill were to pass, because at a briefing in District 5 Headquarter's in Paris within the past month they did have the new guidelines, the federal guidelines down, brief us on the sign location rules that the Federal Government has come down with?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator -- Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

You're talking about locations. We're talking about time. I -- I'm not sure just - in fact, I don't know exactly what the Federal requirements are, but I'm sure they're similar to -- to what we have here in the State. The thing that I'm saying is that - and I didn't dream up this bill, and I'm about ready to rest my case. JCAR gave me this bill, and the thing that we're suppose to be doing, if we're going to serve on JCAR, is to see that they don't over step their authority, and I think if they wanted - want to change this, and all they got to do is -- is submit some legislation.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Woodyard.

#### SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, here again, staying away - out of the JCAR agency dispute. In that briefing bill, actually that time frame of location of the sign -- did - was part of the rules that came down from -- from the Federal Government that IDOT had to adopt, and that's what I don't understand. If -- if this bill prohibits the adoption of that time frame, it looks to me like it's in direct conflict with what the Federal Government is telling us to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

#### SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Senator Woodyard, I'm sure if this was a conflict with the Federal Government, JCAR wouldn't be recommending the legislation.

I -- I feel confident that - yeah, I rest my case.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Karpiel, for the second time.

## SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for the second time because my name was used in debate in connection with perhaps being talked to by the Department of Transportation on this bill.

I just want to emphasize no one from the Department of Transportation has spoken to me about this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Donahue, for the second time.

# SENATOR DONAHUE:

I, too, apologize for rising a second time, but this is something - a point that I would like to raise to the Vice-Chairman of this committee, or the Chairman of JCAR. It is my understanding, and I served in a sub-committee that met on these bills to talk about the JCAR legislative package. And we

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

discussed at that time, that you as a chairman - co-chairman of this would stand up and explain to the Legislative Body exactly what the next series of bills was all about. Not just that there are JCAR bills, but to explain the purpose, the reason, and that just because they're JCAR doesn't mean that everybody on that committee has signed off. This is not the right way to go about it. JCAR is over stepping their bounds, and I object to this legislation, and I hope we can vote it down.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.to close.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 724 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, they're are 26 Ayes, 24 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having failed to receive the necessary majority, the bill fails. Senate Bill 725. Senator Jones. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 725.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

For what purpose do you arise, Senator Newhouse?

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I -- I arise, Madam President, because I had a malfunction on this nutty button, again. I want to have in the record that I voted Yes on that bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The record will be...

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

...and I would hope that some how, some day, we get some buttons that we can push, and reasonably expect them to record our votes up on that board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The records will so show that Senator Newhouse was recorded. Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR FAWELL:

I want to report a malfunction of my switch. I would have cancelled you out, Senator. So, don't feel bad. You know, I've hit my button twice now today, and it has not recorded.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell, the record will so show you as voting No on the -- on the past vote. Now, Senate Bill -- on the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 725. Senator Jones. Senator Jones.

#### SENATOR JONES:

Get the noise level down, I can't hear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator -- Senator Jones requests that you please lower your voices, and take your conferences off the Floor. Senator Jones. SENATOR JONES:

I really didn't make the request. But the next series of bills, 725, 726 and 727 are all JCAR bills. And -- Senate Bill 725 amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act, and the AIDS Confidential -- Confidentiality Act to provide that the Department of Children and Family Services shall provide to the temporary caretaker of a child any information in the Department's possession concerning communicable disease that the child has. Also, the confidence -- confidentiality of such information is also included in here - that it cannot be disclosed or given to anyone. This is a recommendation from JCAR, because the DCFS at - from time to time do have these children, but they feel they want

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

to inform the caretaker of that child, but they need statutory authority to do such. And I know of no opposition, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 725 pass? Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. — all voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the constitutional majority, Senate Bill 725 is declared passed. Senate Bill 726. Senator Jones.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill,.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, -- Madam President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 726 amends the School Code and requires - and the State Board of Education is required to establish policies for maintaining uniform difficulty level, and to set a passing score for teacher certification tests. In the promulgation of the rules for the State Board of Education concerning certification testing for teachers, they were incomplete, and needed this legislation. I know of no opposition, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates that he will yield.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR FAWELL:

Is this another JCAR bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

It -- I said that the next series of bills, and this is the second one. And this is legislation that the State Board of Education need as -- to -- in relationship to its certification for teachers. And they agree with the legislation, and I know of no other opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 726 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are none, none voting Present. And Senate Bill --726, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 727. Senator Jones. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 727.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 727 amends the Administrative Procedure Act, and that — and states that certain provisions of the Act, regarding rule making, shall not apply to the Pollution Control Board Rules in determination on specific matters. This legislation is needed as

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

a result of the bill we passed last Session, which was Senate Bill 1824, in the promulgation of the rules. And certain aspects of the rules - not necessarily needed, as relate to the Administrative Procedures Act, - a JCAR bill. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 727 pass. Those -- sorry. Senator Welch, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I've got a question of the sponsor. I had my light on. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates that he'll yield.

# SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, what's the Pollution Control Board's position on this bill? Do they have one?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator -- Senator Jones.

# SENATOR JONES:

The Pollution -- Control Board has not contacted me as such. They are not in opposition to it. What we are doing are exempting them from certain of the rule making requirements for certain particulars in that Act. And this is the reason why this bill is needed.

PRESIDING OFFICER; (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Zito. No. Senator Welch.

## SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Jones, last year one of the reasons we had a major change in rule making, was because of the report by one of the Governor's staffer's that rules going through the Pollution Control Board took over eighteen months to become drafted. Now is this going to reverse that small amount of progress we made last

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

year, or - I'm not exact sure what it is you're exempting, or if
it is good or bad. Just exactly what are you doing?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Jones.

# SENATOR JONES:

No, we are not going to go back, and you were part of that. But Senate Bill 1824, if you recall when we passed that last year, was a result of all those reports that were issued. And what we are doing here is - certain procedures in the Act, they need exemptions, because they fall under the guidelines with the -- in conformity with the Federal guidelines. And therefore, we are exempting them from the Administrative Procedures -- Procedures Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Jones, to close.

# SENATOR JONES:

Ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 727 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Madam Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 727, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. If everyone will pay attention now, the Chair will yield to Senator Watson for the purpose of introduction of a special guest.

# SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Appreciate the opportunity in yielding this time to us. We have - we certainly do have a special guest with us here today. He's from my district. He and

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

his mother are both here from Centralia. The young man worked his way up in Illinois politics, and became Press Secretary for President Ronald Reagan. He's been an inspiration to all of us throughout his public life, and continues to be an inspiration to us. We can all learn from what he's been through and the attitude that still prevails among Jim Brady. And Jim and Dorothy Brady, as I mentioned, his mother to his left there, are with us here today. And I certainly want to welcome you, Jim and Dorothy, to the Illinois Senate and certainly wish you well, and we'd like to hear a few words from you, if you would.

MR. JIM BRADY:

(Remarks given by Jim Brady)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

...(machine cutoff)... All right. Will the Members return to their seats, please. We're going to return to Page 32, at the bottom of the page. On the Order of 3rd Reading. Everybody please return to your seats. All right. On the bottom of Page 32, on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 729. Senator Thomas Dunn. Read the bill, please, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 729.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill will standardize the probationary period for the lowest ranked fireman in all the State of Illinois and make it a one-year probationary period for all. I urge adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Fawell.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I hope all of the - my colleagues are listening to this bill. I've gotten a couple of letters so far from my municipalities asking me to vote against this bill. The reason is that they, unlike some of the larger municipalities, do not have continual classes. And so, if this bill is passed, it could -- be conceivable that a person would only be on probation for one or two months because of the way the classes are structured. I would ask you, please to look at this bill. The Municipal League is against it. So is the Fire Protection District Association and the Fire Chiefs Association. It will present a problem to the smaller municipalities. And therefore, I rise in opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion. Senator Schuneman. Could we have some order, please? Could we -- could we please have some order? Thank you. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well -- thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates that he'll yield.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I'm not sure we're on the right bill that I'm concerned about, but I -- I had to ask. Some of the -- the volunteer firemen in my area are concerned about proposals that are in Springfield, that would require classes and training for volunteer firemen. Does this effect volunteer firemen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

I -- I don't believe it does, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, you know, I appreciate your answer, but I don't really think that's -- that's good enough. I - I'm not about to vote for anything here that would diminish the ability of our fine local volunteer fire departments to -- to get members. Well, then you should know whether this effects them or not. All right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

The answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Dunn do you wish to close?

# SENATOR THOMAS DUNN:

I do. This -- this bill was brought to me by the Firefighters, and it represents their -- their wishes, and it gives them something that they can rely on. It's -- it's a well known fact that -- that firemen at the low end of -- of the rank sometimes have to tow the line for sometimes up to four years. It's used as a ploy by certain people. This is a fair period. It's one year. There are no schools that can't get a firemen through in one year. I urge adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

I'm sorry, Senator Dunn. Senator Alexander's light is on. Senator Alexander.

#### SENATOR ALEXANDER:

Thank you, Mr. President. And to the sponsor, I'm sorry I did not raise this question earlier. Does Senate Bill 729 still preempt home rule municipalities?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dunn.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

# SENATOR T. DUNN:

Yes, Senator. As I said in my opening remarks, it's for all of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion. Senator Raica.

# SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a fair bill for the Firefighters. All they're asking is that if someone who's a probationary firefighter just have the one-year probation. I guess and a few other problems that they're having some extend it to eighteen months to two and half years. And all we're doing is making it the fair down the road with a lot of other departments. I solicit an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 729 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 41, the Nays are 5, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 729, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Keats.

# SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege. This is the third or fourth time today I've hit my switch and nothing happens. Could I please - some people would allege that it will improve my voting record. Thanks, Arthur. But I would been -- I would have voted Yes, had it counted. But could I ask after today, I mean this is not once or twice, I mean it's getting pretty consistent on my voting switch. I hit it. Nothing happens. I hit it again. Noting happens. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, just an add on to what Senator Keats had - first of all, every person sitting in that Chair has a different rhythm. And then we change Secretaries, and they have a different rhythm. What I would suggest, as I suggested the other day, is count to one thousand, and then hit the button that closes off the vote. Because there is - there's a time lapse by the time we hit this button, till it gets up there and -- hard to follow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

The -- the Chair could request you -- vote on the first "have all voted who wish?". I usually go, at least three, so if we could all vote on the first time out, no one will get caught. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

We've all gotten caught this Session. And our problem is, is that the system doesn't work as fast as the older system. We used to be able to watch Senator DeAngelis' light and figure out what we're were going to do. We can't do that any longer, because you can't wait till the last second and push the button 'cause it doesn't work. And so I would, you know, just caution everybody not to key off of Senator DeAngelis this time, because it doesn't work that way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. At the bottom of Page 32 is Senate Bill 731. On the Order of -- 3rd Reading. Senator Jacobs. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 731.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First of all let me add that my -- my button works fabulously. But let me just add that this bill adds that elected adjutant officers of a Statewide labor organization shall be granted leave for work hours devoted to performing organization duties, provided that the elected officer has arranged for a firefighter to work these hours. These - this bill was originally opposed by the fire districts, but being as we took the -- the compensation out of it, there is no compensation, no cost. They have removed that. It is - I know of no known opposition other than...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 731 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 731, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of Page 33, on the Order of 3rd Reading - that was on Recall today, we'll skip over that. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 733. Senator Carroll. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 733.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

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

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate. Senate Bill 733 is an effort to require an audit of the Health Finance Reform Act, so that we can get better handle on what the actual services are, and the costs of those services — the availability of physicians — the areas of the State being underserved or over served. I would ask for a favorable roll call and answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 733 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, 0 voting Present. And Senate Bill 733, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 734. Senator Carroll. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 734.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Carroll.

# SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Hospitals around this State have had a unique problem in dealing with the area known as Specialty Care. This is a type of care that is-burn-type units, transplants, inpatient psychiatric, trauma units, things of that nature. And what has happened, apparently, is because of the inequities of the ICARE Program, there's not been enough recognized days of service paid for, to these hospitals, for care actually provided. This bill would provide that there must be a pre-admission procedure for Specialty

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Care. There must be concurrent review of the Specialty Care, meaning that they have to be monitoring the services performed, and making sure they're valid while, in fact, the patient is in care, but also says that you cannot limit a hospital's Specialty Care days. As we know, through the bidding procedure, hospitals get a specific number of days. When they get one of these Specialty Care cases, it becomes impossible for them to fall within that type of categorization, because you don't know how long a Burn Unit person is going to have to stay, or a trauma case. So what this says is - with prior approval of the State, that these people will be receiving this type of care. They cannot be limited in the days it takes to treat these people, and must be compensated under the agreed-to-rates. I would urge a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Oh yes, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is, I guess, one of three bills that the Illinois Hospital Association has put forward. They're all pending, capacity or another, and this is kind of the first to reach, know, 3rd Reading. For starters, the fiscal impact on this we figure to be 52.2 million dollars annually. I don't know State has the money. So, if you haven't contemplated income tax, you might want to start contemplating, should this pass. think the ICARE Program, for good or for ill, and it has had an upswing and a down-swing, and, you know, it's worked, and it has not worked. But, by and large, it has tried to save money for the State of Illinois. If these kind of bills pass, we're going to start the dismantling of that program, and we're not going to have anybody kind of watching the store to see how reimbursements are made. I think I'm concerned, especially personally, about

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

funding for a new category of Specialty Care, which is a Level 1 Trauma Center. And I think the problem with that is - is that we want to fund those that are existence in some capacity, whether they need to be in existence or not, rather than where the service should be provided, and I think that's kind of where we should be looking, in general. I think the bill has a lot of questions that are involved here, and I'm hopeful that other people will ask, so that, possibly, Senator Carroll can clarify some of the various concepts that come up, as we go through on this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll, to close. SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate. We do recognize that there will be a cost, although the Department of Public Aid suggestions appear to be very high. in addition, while Senator Topinka accurately described that which the Department said, of course the Federal Government reimburse approximately fifty percent of that amount. I think at issue, though, is -- that I think we have to recognize the problem that exists in Illinois today - of making care, particularly hospital care, accessible and affordable. Both of those elements of a good health care system. With sixteen hospitals having closed throughout Illinois in the last two years, rural Illinois as well as urban Illinois, there is truly an access to care issue. Eighteen percent of the hospital expenses are for dealing With what is now know as Specialty Care. Eighteen percent - of which a significant portion goes unpaid for. We have to recognize, unlike most businesses in Illinois, a hospital must treat a person who comes into their doors. If they have federal funds in construction, which they all have the Hildburton funds, they are required by federal law to give treatment, whether or not there's going to be any form of compensation.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

without pre-admission review, the Department, sometimes as much as six months after the delivery of service, says to these health care institutions "We are not going to pay for the person treated in a Burn Care Unit, in a Transplant Unit, in a Trauma Unit, even though you gave the services." Six months after services were rendered, the Department refuses to pay because of the number of days they contracted for. That just inappropriate treatment of people who are ill. What this says is; come in in advance, do your preadmission screening, and do your concurrent review. Make sure the State is not getting ripped off by the institution. But if the person must be there in this type of Specialty Care, and that is what is medically appropriated, and preappproved, and concurrently screened - then pay for it instead of requiring hospitals to go under, or insurance rates to increase. I would urge a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 734 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 32, the Nays are 22, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 734, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 6

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 735. Senator Carroll. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 735.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Carroll.

# SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a very interesting concept that I believe will be very cost-effective for Illinois. It is something our neighboring State of Michigan has done for about seven years now, as well as New York, and several other states, and it's known as managed care. What we find, particularly in the Public Aid sector of health care, is people come into the system because of some emergency. And there's no one central place that has a history a medical history on that particular recipient. So what you have is a -- duplication of services - of x-rays - of blood tests - of prescriptions - counter prescriptions given; meaning one doctor gives you a prescription, another doctor not knowing that you were being cared for gives you something else that counter-balances the first. And what we have found, in monitoring other states, is a managed care system that you and I use, meaning a general practitioner who is there to observe your general condition. any time you enter the system, that person is notified and monitors the care you are to get; and the Specialty Care you have to need indicates that. Overall, we will find less tests given, and thereby save money. And overall, better medical care given, less medications given, and an ultimate savings in money. I do know that the department has indicated about a million dollar cost. Although that seems illogical from all those who have viewed it, because the states that have, in fact, imposed it have incurred significant savings by managing the delivery of health

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

care. This proposes a test, one in rural Illinois, and one in urban Illinois, for Medicaid patients, and see how that test works. If it works, let's implement it, and if it doesn't, let's junk it. But if our sister states prove anything, I believe they will prove that this works to give more effective health care, and least expensive health care. And I would urge a favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As Senator Carroll noted, this does cost a million dollars, and I am going to bite my lip and, personally, I'm going to vote for it, but I think - I've - 'cause I do think it's a good idea in the long run. You do, apparently, have a -- an end on this, I mean it's not going to go on forever. So, it does kind of investigate what's going on, and may have a real positive-type of result here, but that million dollars does bother me. I just put it out there for everybody to know it costs some money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

# SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he'll yield.

## SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Carroll, as I read my analysis - I don't have a copy of the bill. This says basically, this test program, which does seem to be a decent idea, is limited, basically, to hospital facilities. Now, if there's one thing we've discovered in cost-efficient health care, we're moving away from hospitals, we're moving to outpatient care. The only outpatient care I see is that controlled by hospitals.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you for raising that point. Your analysis did not carry the analysis of the amendment. The amendment corrected that very serious flaw in the original legislation. I totally agree with you, which is why we amended it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll, to close.

SENATOR CARROLL:

I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 735 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 46, the Nays are 11, none voting Present. And Senate BIll 735, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 737. Senator Brookins. I'm sorry, that's on a Recall List. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 740. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 740 amends the Revenue Act, and deals with the question of redemption of property, and shifts the payment imposed

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

on a tax purchaser to the redeemer, to pay for funds that have been advanced from public funds of the police and welfare power under which a municipality may hold a lien, so that now the redeemer will pay for that lien rather than the purchaser. I know of no objection would ask for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Question? Any discussion? Senator Keats.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

Again, maybe just that we don't have all the information available - I'm reading what I have. Many municipalities are so happy to get somebody to redeem what they've got, that they will give them special breaks and offers and et cetera. Does this take away a municipality's ability to offer special deals to get people to redeem some of this property?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR KEATS:

Is -- is -- as -- as an example -- as an example, on the West side of Chicago, they do this quite extensively trying to get some of this property back on the rolls and people working with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

This does not effect that, whatsoever. Somebody who purchases the property where there's tax delinquencies would not have to pay the liens.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 740 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 57, Nays none, 0 voting

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Present. And Senate Bill 740, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. In the middle of Page 33 is Senate Bill 741. On the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 741.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

#### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 741 clarifies the Power of Attorney Act that we passed last year - last Session. It gives the -- a designated agent the power to make decisions for another person. It encompasses health care decisions, and includes the decisions to make an organ donation, if the individual so wishes. The person granting the authority may limit the scope of the powers, such as not granting the agent the power to make an anatomical gift, not authorizing an autopsy. It also clarifies, as the Medical Society wished, that if a doctor refused to remove life support systems there - and notified the agent, there would be no liability on the physician. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 741 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are 2, none voting Present. Senate Bill 741, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 742. Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 742 does several things that have been requested by the Realtors and Condominium Associations across the State. Included is that the - requires that the annual budget of an association provide for reasonable reserves for repair or replacement of the common elements. At present, the Act does not require an association to establish reserve accounts. And, although many associations establish such reserves, in light of the fiduciary obligation imposed upon condominium directors, the condominium committees of the Bar Associations believe that the Act should require an association to establish repair or replacement reserves. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Karpiel.

# SENATOR KARPIEL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he'll yield.

## SENATOR KARPIEL:

Senator Marovitz, you might wonder what my question - you may - you probably don't wonder what my question is going to be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Ask your question.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Well, you're deleting the provisions of a bill that I just passed last year. And I really don't care, except I'm just wondering why; because that was requested of me, you know, by the -- by the CBA also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

## SENATOR MAROVITZ:

We -- we amended the bill to put that back in. So that any attorney's fees that were charged would have to be charged for services that were actually already incurred. So we - as it came out of the -- out of the committee, it didn't have that in, we put that back in by amendment on the Floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Keats. All right. Further discussion? Senator Berman.

#### SENATOR BERMAN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he'll yield.

## SENATOR BERMAN;

At the present time, the decision as to whether reserves should be established is made by each individual board. As I understand the explanation, this bill would require reserves to be established, even if a board in the past hasn't done so, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

It would require -- require reasonable reserves for repair or replacement of common elements. And what has happened to many buildings, and I'm only talking about what -- what has happened to many buildings, they have not provided any reserves, there have

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

been major expenses incurred. They have not been able to meet those expenses, and it has caused, really, the severe depreciation of the entire building and the common elements that are crucial to that building. And this is — this is — this is the kind of thing in hearings, in ASCO, that came up, and that they — they agreed there should be some reserves for the kind of — the kind of serious events which may not be able to be foreseen, but which could come up and — and severely inhibit the building.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Has ASCO or ASCA taken a position on -- on this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

It is my position that they are in favor of this. It's my understanding that they are in favor of this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 742 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hall all voted wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 742, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 746 was on Recall. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 747. Senator del Valle. Senator del Valle. Senator Bill 747.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 747.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 747 requires that if ICC orders a utility to make a refund or credit to customers, because the commission has found rate to be excessive, the refund shall proportionate to the amount the customer was over-charged. The utility shall complete the refund, or apply the credit, over no more than a three month period. The courts already overturned several illegal rate hikes by the ICC. And consumer groups predict that hundreds of millions in refunds may owed to utility customers. When consumers succeed in winning refunds, the refunds should be calculated fairly, and should be returned promptly. This bill ensures that both take place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would agree with my -- my colleague, Senator del Valle, that something has to be done. It's my understanding, Senator, that there is still some ongoing discussions as per a possible amendment, which will be worked out. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Yes, Senator Jacobs. There will be additional discussions; and there may be an amendment in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senator del Valle, I -- I'm curious to know why we -- we don't want the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Commerce Commission to determine what the -- what the duration of that time frame might be. Why are we -- why are we mandating that in law in at three months? I'm concerned about the problems that might create.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, this is to ensure a prompt refund for the consumers. And that's the intent, clearly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, I -- I quess I under -- I understand that. But -but isn't it better for the Commerce Commission, that has all the facts and figures before them, to make that determination? you know I, I can appreciate what you're doing, and I support what you're doing. I -- I -- I just don't like to see us arbitrarily pick a time frame, three months, if you will, which, you know, that - that's the time frame when that money has to be paid back after the decision is rendered. It could create serious cash flow problems for -- for the company. I understand there's a bill coming over from the House that has a six-month period on it. That certainly is better, but I -- I really am concerned about the Legislature mandating this time frame. Whereas the Commerce Commission, who is in a position to be able to make a realistic proposal, perhaps ought to continue to make that decision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Is that a question, Senator Maitland? Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

# SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I just rise in opposition to this bill also. I think, first of all, we're making a mistake in

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

just arbitrarily taking away one of the powers of the Commerce Commission, and making this arbitrary decision of three months. Sometimes these utilities, when they do owe a great many - in a refund, it makes it very difficult for them to do it in three months when they - if they have a cash flow problem. I just think that this is something that could be argued before the Commerce Commission, and we have CUB and some these groups that can do that. For us to legislatively just put a arbitrary three-month period on it, I think is a mistake.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussions? Senator Macdonald.

#### SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to this bill. I think that this bill certainly does fly in the face of the responsibility of the Commerce Commission itself. And for the reasons that the speakers before have objected to this bill, I too, at this stage, certainly would say that I am opposed to this bill. I would like to ask of the sponsor, what are the nature —what is the nature of the amendments that you plan to put on this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, Senator Macdonald, I think that the there's still room for discussion on the length of the period during which the refund should be made. I -- I don't know whether that should be four months, or three months, or six months. But certainly, we need to indicate clearly, the period within which these refunds need to be made. These dollars belong to the consumer. The utilities have an obligation to return those dollars to where they belong, and they belong with the consumer. What we're doing through this amendment in the Public Utilities Act is ensuring that we're

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

protecting the consumer's rights to a refund that they are entitled to -- in a prompt manner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Macdonald.

# SENATOR MACDONALD:

Yes. I think -- I think that the explanation given by the sponsor of this bill even -- even further clarifies a need for this particular issue to be handled by the Commerce Commission alone. I -- I think that they have all of the facts and the figures. And I think that -- that when we don't even know what amendments we wanted - when we were unclear actually as to what the time frame should be - that's all the more reason why we have a Commerce Commission; and it's all the more reason for us not to take that prerogative away from the Commerce Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? If not, Senator del Valle, to close. SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, this -- this bill is meant to ensure that consumers are treated fairly. And that once a ruling is made, that the results of that are carried out in a prompt manner, so that the dollars that belong to the rate payers are returned to the rate payers. I move that I get a favorable roll call on this bill.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 747 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? ...(machine cutoff)... Have all voted who wish? Have all vote who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 29, the Nays 26, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 747, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. The sponsor asks postponed consideration for Senate Bill 747. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 749. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Demuzio.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a very simple bill. It just says that a Voter Registration Card, which the State Board of Education is currently required to maintain, shall provide a space on the -- for the applicants phone number. It does not require the applicant to fill in his phone number. It just simply says that there will be space on the Voter Registration Card for the phone number if the person voluntarily wishes to list it. And that is precisely all that it does, and I would ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Keats.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

Not to sound like too much of a neophyte, but to ask a question. What will this bill say when it comes back from the House, could you give us a guess on that, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Demuzio.

# SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Exactly as I just explained to you. It will be - it will provide for a voluntary - a mandate -- a -- requires a box to be put on the Voter Registration Card for the new registrants phone number. And does not require the voter to put -- to -- to list his phone number, but only a voluntary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 749 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 749, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 751. Senator Rock. Senator Rock. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 753. Senator Schuneman. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 753.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 753 would provide indemnification and representation for members of the CHIPS board. As you know, the State of Illinois provides legal counsel and indemnification for a wide range of State employees and State boards and commissions. This bill simply extends that coverage to the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan, and I would ask for your approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 753 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 753, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

At the bottom of Page 33 is Senate Bill 760. On the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 760.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Mahar.

# SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is just exactly as the Calendar says. It creates the -- Matteson Civic Center Authority along the Interstate 57 corridor. I think it's similar to bills that have passed through this Body many times before. I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 760 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 760, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of Page 34, on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 761. Senator Smith. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 761.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Smith.

# SENATOR SMITH:

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

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senate Bill 761 merely amends the -- amends the Public It provides that the Department of Public Aid shall develop and implement outreach program an to increase participation in the Federal Food Stamps Program. Fiscal funds for the outreach activities are included in the Department's fiscal 1990 budget. And it also has been recommended by the Citizens Assembly for Public Aid. I ask for your favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Keats.

# SENATOR KEATS:

I don't want to sound too hardcore, but -- if our - any of my brethren look at it, will you look at -- your -- your list of what's in this bill. We are now soliciting Public Aid Recipients in Illinois. I don't know that that's necessarily the policy you want to get into - to go out and ask people if they'll please take food stamps.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

I -- I would like to make note on this bill that the Department of Public Aid has built this into their budget. So, it is nothing that they are not anticipating, and I merely call that to your attention.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Smith, to close.

#### SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. I merely wanted to say to Senator Keats, they are not soliciting. Not soliciting at all. I ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. The question is, Senator -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 761 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 30, Nays 24, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 761, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Keats has requested a verification. Will all the Senators be in their seats. The Secretary will please read the affirmative votes.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

The following voted in the affirmative: Alexander -Alexander, Berman, Brookins, Carroll, Collins, D'Arco, del Valle,
Demuzio, Ralph Dunn, Thomas Dunn, Geo-Karis, Hall, Holmberg,
Jacobs, J.J. Joyce, Kelly, Lechowicz, Luft, Mahar, Marovitz,
Netsch, Newhouse, O'Daniel, Savickas, Severns, Smith, Topinka,
Vadalabene, and Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Do you have any questions, Senator Keats?

SENATOR KEATS:

Starting - Senator Thomas Dunn?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Thomas Dunn. Is he in the Chamber? Sitting in his seat.

SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Kelly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Richard Kelly. Sitting in his seat.

SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Lechowicz.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Lechowicz. Is Senator Lechowicz in the Chamber? Senator Lechowicz? Strike his name, please, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Savickas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Savickas. Senator Savickas is standing in the back. SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Topinka?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Topinka. Senator Topinka in the the Chamber? Senator Topinka. Strike her name, please, Mr. Secretary. Further questions? Further questions? All right. The roll call has been verified. The Ayes are 28, the Nays are 24, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 761, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared ... (machine cutoff)... Okay, the question -- ...(machine cutoff)... The sponsor requests Postponed Consideration on Senate Bill 761. All right. Order of 3rd Reading, at the Top of Page 34 is Senate Bill 762. Senator Smith. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 762.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

No. Take it out of the record, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Take this bill out of the record, at the sponsor's request, please Mr. Secretary. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 764. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Mahar.

# SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's very simply at the request of the State Fire Marshall's Office, and the Fire Protection Districts in Illinois - bans the sale of fireworks through the mail.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question -- I'm sorry. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Ban them through the mail?

SENATOR MAHAR:

Yeah.

SENATOR WATSON:

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 764? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 764 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, and none voting Present. And Senate Bill 764, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 769. Senator Severns. Senator Severns. 769. Out of the record. Senate Bill 772 is on Recall. Senate Bill 774 was on Recall. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senator Bill 782. Senator Hall.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Hall, will you wish to proceed with 782. Read the bill, please, Mr. -- No. Hold the bill -- hold the bill. Out of the record. In the middle of Page 34 is Senate Bill 785. Senator Welch. Out of the record. It was on the Recall List. I said 7-7-2 was on the Recall List this - today. On the middle of Page 34 is Senate Bill 789. Senator D'Arco. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 789.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. There were some objections to this bill that we removed on 2nd Reading. It is in pristine form now, I would think, and it requires, with respect to any sponsor, political committee, or candidate, the listing of such sponsor, or candidate with -- within the name of the political committee. And it also requires campaign disclosure form and notices of obligation to be sent by first-class mail. Everything else is out of the bill, and I would -- I would move to pass 789.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

My analysis says that this bill will repeal the disclaimer's statement on literature soliciting campaign funds, is that right? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator D'Arco.

# SENATOR D'ARCO:

I told you, we took out all the bad stuff, Adeline, and that's one of them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 789 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. Oh, I'm very sorry. Senator Philip. SENATOR PHILIP:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR PHILIP:

Am I led to believe that you're taking off the disclosure off of campaign literature and mail that might perhaps solicit funds? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

#### SENATOR D'ARCO:

Boy, oh boy, oh boy. I just told Adeline, I mean, Senator Geo-Karis, that we removed that onerous provision from the bill. So it's no longer applicable.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Philip.

# SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, that's -- that's fine. Let me ask you this question. Exactly what are you doing with this bill, I don't think I quite understood what you said, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

## SENATOR D'ARCO:

Well, no. What we're doing, we are requiring with respect to

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

any sponsor political committee or candidate the listing of the sponsor or candidate within the name of the political committee. We are also requiring that all campaign disclosure forms be sent by first-class mail to State central, county central committees and ward and township organizations. The provision about taking — that's what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, obviously everything is out of it; I'm just assuming it's a vehicle for something, is that correct, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

No. We had lengthy debate about some of the onerous provisions, and its not -- they -- they really want to do these things.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Hello. Hello. Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

If I might ask the sponsor just one question. You have in your bill, the potential to file a complaint against somebody other than a campaign committee or a candidate. Could you give me some examples, of who you have in mind that you'd be going after? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Well, what time is it? It's twenty after four? Okay. No, that was removed too.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator D'Arco, are you -- am I to understand that you're saying that is not a vehicle bill, or it is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator D'Arco.

#### SENATOR D'ARCO:

No. This -- this is the Income Tax Bill. Wait around awhile; it will be the cigarette tax bill, and it will be the gas tax bill, and every other bill you want.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, in that case, I urge everybody - at least on this side, to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator D'Arco, you wish to close? SENATOR D'ARCO:

No.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 789 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On the question, the Ayes are 30, Nays 28, none voting Present. Senate Bill 789, having received a required constitutional -- majority, is declared passed. Senator Dudycz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DUDYCZ

I'd like to verify the affirmative votes.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

All right. Senator Dudycz has requested a verification. All Senators will be in their seats, and the Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

The following voted in the affirmative: Alexander, Berman, Brookins, Carroll, Collins, D'Arco, del Valle, Demuzio, Thomas Dunn, Hall, Holmberg, Jacobs, Jones, J.J. Joyce, Kelly, Lechowicz, Luft, Marovitz, Netsch, Newhouse, O'Daniel, Rea, Savickas, Severns, Smith, Vadalabene, Welch, Zito and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Question, Senator Dudycz?

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Brookins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Brookins. Sitting in his chair.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Jones just walked in. Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

He did not vote. Senator Joyce is not on the roll call.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Carroll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Carroll. Senator Carroll in the Chambers? Senator Carroll. Sir, is Senator Carroll in the Chambers? Strike his name, please, Mr. Secretary. All right. Return Senator Carroll's name to the roll call, please. Further questions? Senator Dudycz. All right. The roll call has been verified. The Ayes are 30, the Nays are 28, none voting Present, and Senate Bill 789, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 790. Senator D'Arco. Read the bill, please, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 790.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. This exempts motor — it exempts motor vehicles, not required to be registered, from the minimum liability requirements of insurance in the State of Illinois. It also provides that substitute amend, replacement and supplement policies are not subject to required one-time offer of certain underinsured and uninsured coverages. I don't know of any known opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, could you give us some examples of the kind of vehicles that would no longer be provided with uninsured motorist insurance?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you. Senator Schuneman, to be honest with you, I'm not sure. Apparently, these are vehicles that are not required to be registered in the State now. And because of that, I would -- I would think they would be something like mopeds, some other forms of three-wheel vehicles, things of that nature. Stock racing cars, they're telling me, that's possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, if you're not sure who you're exempting here, I'm curious to know, you know, the old question, who wants this bill? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

I think the Insurance Industry wants it. But if you like, I'll take it out of the record, and I'll find out exactly what's in it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- Senator Schuneman.

### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I -- I don't even know that I'm opposed to it. I'm just curious about it. You know, we've required uninsured motorists to be provided on every auto policy that's issued in this State for a number of years, and I'm curious to know what -- what we're doing here. I can think of several kinds of policies where automobile insurance policies are issued on vehicles that normally don't go on the roads. For example, snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles, and - but mopeds, of course, do, in fact, go on the highway and -- and the roads all the time. So, I'm not particularly opposed to your bill; I'm not quite sure what it is you're doing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO

Well, why don't we take it out of the record, and we'll find out exactly what kind of vehicles we're talking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Take it out of the record. 791. Senator D'Arco. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 791. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 791.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you. Mr. President, this bill provides that insurance companies that share information with the State Fire Marshall's Office or other agencies, on fire losses which they believe may not have been accidental, are entitled to receive relevant information, which they have requested on the matter, from those agencies within thirty days. The present law - under current law, they - an insurance company that suspects a fire may not have --been accidental must inform the appropriate agencies. This would provide that they're entitled to this information from the Fire Marshall's office within thirty days.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, Senator -- Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, for those of us on this side of the aisle, Mr. President, I think this is a reasonable proposal and we should support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 791 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 791, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 794. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 794.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 794 amends the Clinical Psychologists Licensing Act to provide that a person may use the title of psychologist if that person possesses a Doctoral Degree in Psychology, and is an academic employee of an institution of higher education, so long as that person does not render any of the services defined as those of a clinical psychologist. So — it's simply, you know, that's all that the bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill really cleans up a problem in the Act, that resulted from some previous correspondence. This was one of those bills that we were going to include on our recommended Agreed Bill List. So, we stand in support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 794 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 794, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 795, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 795.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is a proposal of the Illinois Hospital Association's action -- Access To Care Today package. What it would do is appoint a task force to execute a study concerning the processing of applications for Medicaid, submitted on behalf of applicants by hospitals. Originally, the Department of Public Aid was opposed to the bill because of the time frame. I put an amendment on there extending the reporting date to March 31, 1990. They have now taken a neutral position on the bill. I'd be glad to try to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. If I may ask a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The Gentleman indicates he will yield. Senator Topinka.

#### SENATOR TOPINKA:

The idea is not a bad one, but did you ever consider, or would you consider, possibly, like the Citizens Council on -- on Public Aid for reviewing something like this; as opposed to having the Department kind of appoint and study itself, to report back to itself, then a report to us?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, I -- I'm not a great fan of creating more citizen councils. I think we were - okay. Well, the bill itself says who's going to be on the committee. The appointing of the task force is going to be composed of Members of the General Assembly, the Department itself, the Hospital Association, Hospital's Welfare Rights Organizations, and the general public, as deemed

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

appropriate by directorate. So, in this, we're going to get cross-section. Hopefully, it'll come back with a report, and go out of existence by March of 1990.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 795 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. that question, the Ayes are 44, the Nays are 8, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 795, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 800. Senator Dunn. 806. Senator Zito. Senator Friedland. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of Page 34 is Senate Bill 814, Madam - Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 814.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Friedland.

#### SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 814 would provide that persons should be -- would be ineligible for general assistance if they are on strike, due to a labor dispute, at the place where they were employed. It mirrors federal law because, as you know, federal requirements under the AFDC Program and Food Stamp Program prohibit stamps for strikers. Also, this bill is presented on behalf of the Township Officials and it's an attempt to save townships some money, and I urge your favorable support of this measure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Discussion? Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator Friedland, you're one of my favorite people over there. I've got — I've got a couple of concerns though. Number one, if my memory serves me right, during the John Deere strike there was a ruling that come down from the court, which said that the members were not eligible for — for assistance. So, we do have court cases which point this out. And I just think it's a little bit unfair to — to — to rub it in the faces of some of these people, especially in light of the fact that our recent strike here in the Senate, there were people who got paid.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hudson.

# SENATOR HUDSON:

Well, with all due respects to Senator Jacobs, I do rise in support of this. I think that if — if that is — if what Senator Friedland has mind is the intent of the courts, it seems to me to be little harm in passing this bill, which would reinforce the concept. And furthermore, I think what we're doing here is leaving these disputes between the — the business people involved and the unions and others, rather than placing the support of — of these particular individuals, who are on strike, on the backs of the taxpayers. So, I think that it is — it is a reasonable bill, and one that I would urge you to support.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Friedland may close. Question is -- question is, shall Senate Bill 814 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 28, the Nays are 28, none voting Present. Senate Bill -- 814, having

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

failed to received the constitutional majority, is declared lost. Senator Friedland requests Postponed Consideration, and he will be afforded that opportunity. Postponed Consideration. Page 35, 8-1-5. Senator Kelly. Top of Page 35 is Senate Bill 8-1-5, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 815.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Bill 815 would require that school treasurers, in the future, be Certified Public Accountants or Certified School Business Officials. legislation, This basically, upgrades the qualification of future appointed school treasurers. This legislation is somewhat of a compromise, because we've had an ongoing battle on the school treasurers up in our suburban area. It only affects Cook County. There's twenty-five treasurers. For the last several years, there's been an effort to terminate school treasurers. That legislation has failed. This is a compromise. I don't know of any opposition to it, and I'd solicit your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senator, does this grandfather in the -- the individuals who are already in place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR KELLY:

Yes, Senator Maitland, it does grandfather in those treasurers that are already in place. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 8-1-5 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 52, the Nays are 3, none voting Present. Senate Bill 8-1-5, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Thomas Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. On Senate Bill 814, I was recorded as a yes vote, and I meant to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there is no roll call because it is on Postponed Consideration. And -- Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 816. Senator Maitland. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 816, Madam Secretary. Read the bill, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 816.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

# SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 816 exempts nurses, who are under the supervision of a licensed Podiatrist or doctor, from having to be accredited for the administration of -- of radioactivity to employees of business at a medical facility that is owned by that business.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 8-1-6 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are 1, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 8-1-6, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 8-1-7. Senator Jones. Senator Jones, on the Floor? Senator Jones, how about 8-1-8? How about 8-1-9? 822. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 822, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 822.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 822, and the following bill, were both included in the recommendations of the Supreme Court to the General Assembly every Session for legislative changes. This one deals with the procedures for appellate review of a variety of administrative decisions. And results, actually, from a -- an appellate court decision involving the Public Utilities Act, in which an appellate court found certain procedural provisions, that deal with direct review, to be in conflict with Rule 335 of the Supreme Court, and therefore, unconstitutional. What the court recommended to us was that we conform a variety of Acts and their procedures. Not the fact of direct appellate review, but the procedures to Rule 335. That is precisely what Senate Bill 8-2-2 does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Could we have an explanation of what Rule 335 is, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

I do not have the text of it with me at the moment, But, what it has to do with is how you go about unfortunately. perfecting appeals to the Appellate Courts. And it - what the court was recommending was that it replace a few provisions, particularly in the Public Utilities Act, in which we had spelled in -- excruciating detail, how such direct review should be accomplished. You know, when you file, how you file, and so forth. And the court, generally by rule, determines the methods by which such appeals are to be perfected. And while I'm sorry I don't have the text to 335 that is, essentially, what it does. And it is - the - one of the provisions, as I indicated, already been held invalid because in conflict with that rule. so what we've done is correct several Statutes just to say when you are perfecting appellate review, that it shall be conformity with Rule 335. It's procedural, it has nothing to do with the substance of what happens.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Keats.

#### SENATOR KEATS:

Am I being unreasonable just to say, could we take this out of the record just long enough to find out what Rule 335 is? 'Cause this is multi-million dollar legal fees, when you're talking about the Public Utilities Act. All I ask is, if we could just -- I'd be glad to back to it. It's probably a fine bill, but I just - maybe we should know what Rule 335 is? Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

May I ask a question of the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

My understanding is - and perhaps, please correct me, 'cause I'm not sure, if there is an appeal, for example, from one of these agencies, at the present time I mean, is the appeal to the Circuit Court, or is it automatically to the Appellate Court?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

That depends on what Statute you're talking about. I'm not attempting to change any of that. I'm not trying to relocate where the appeal goes. For example, in the Public Utilities Act, which was the one that sponsored or that spawned this proposal from the court; we are cutting out a lot of language in this bill that talks about, the party taking appeal shall file with the commission written notice, and there's so many days to do A, there's so many days to do B, and so forth. And just saying that direct appellate review, under this Section, is subject to the applicable Supreme Court Rules. So, that it deals, literally, with procedures, not with to which court the appeal may be taken. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

In -- in other words, all your -- all that your bill does is set up procedures if it should go to a higher court. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR NETSCH:

Yes. That is correct, and I have now been handed, by staff, the text of Rule 335, which covers a full page of the Illinois Revised Statutes. I would be happy to show it to you, Senator Keats. It's exceedingly detailed just about how it is done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Barkhausen.

#### SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Barkhausen.

#### SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Senator Netsch, I'm sorry, I've missed some of the discussion. There was just some concern on our side of the aisle. I started out thinking your bill was fine, and I'm sure it probably is. But, would you mind explaining again, is there -- is there now some inconsistency between these provisions and these various Statutes that are outlined, versus what the Supreme Court rule provides? And is there anything in the Supreme Court rule, if that's what we're going to be exclusively going by, as probably constitutionally we're required to - is there something that provides any -- any sort of fewer procedural safeguards than maybe were set forth, separately, in those other Statutes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

## SENATOR NETSCH:

Not that I am aware of, in answer to your last question. There are some differences in how these matters are -- how the appeal is perfected, time limits and so forth. And the problem that we have is that in one Appellate Court decision, which was Consumers Gas versus Illinois Commerce Commission, the Appellate Court had found that some of the procedural provisions that are

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

currently in the Public Utilities Act were in conflict with Rule 335 and therefore, unconstitutional. You are quite right, when it comes to matters of procedure, about perfecting appeals. The court usually prevails over anything that we do to the contrary, at least when its dealing only with procedural matters. And the court has said, "there are these conflicts, they ought to be clarified." That is the only reason for the -- the bill. I don't know that there's any dramatic difference between what is in this Act and what is in Rule 335. The text of it is over there on your side of the aisle right now, being looked at by Senator Keats. If you want me to, I'll hold this -- take it out of the record, and give everyone a chance to take a look at it. But I -- I don't think it's a major issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

We -- we -- we've talked about it too long. Senator Barkhausen.

### SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

In -- in that particular case, do you know what the remedy for the parties was? I mean, did it -- did it result in -- in one of the parties not being able to perfect their appeal, because they had proceeded under the Statute, rather than pursuant to Rule 335? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

### SENATOR NETSCH:

I'm -- I'm looking for my copy of the decision, which I cannot find, right at the moment. I believe, and I -- I really should not speculate. My recollection is that they were not permitted to perfect the appeal. But don't pin me to the wall on that, I'd have to go back and check the decision, which I have some place in my files.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Barkhausen.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Senator, since you tentatively made the offer, would you have any serious objection to taking out of the -- taking this out of the record for a day?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

No. I -- I didn't really think there was going to be any concern about this. It's a relatively minor matter. But I'll be happy to take it out of the record, and let everyone take a look at Rule 335.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Take it out of the record. We'll come back to it next year. 823. Senator Netsch. On the Order of Senate Bills - Senator Netsch. 823. Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 823, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 823.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This, also, was a recommendation in the Supreme Court's Annual Report to the General Assembly. It involves the setting of utility rates which are charged to customers outside of a municipality by a water utility owned or operated by a municipal corporation. And for - I assume historical reasons, reasons for which I do not understand, for some reason - the current law provides that those rates are to be set by agreement, or by a circuit court. The Supreme Court suggested that courts are really not the best agency, initially,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

to determine utility rates, and that it ought to be done by the agency which -- which possesses the expertise in such matters, which is the Illinois Commerce Commission. And so, the bill simply does that. It says that the rates will be determined by the Illinois Commerce Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Macdonald.

#### SENATOR MACDONALD:

Yes. Senator Netsch, I'd like to ask some questions. In some of those -- the states, which have elected Commerce Commissions, these cases go into the courts, historically. Would this impair that possibility in the event, heaven forbid, that that passes in Illinois, that we have an elected Commerce Commission, and these disputes go to court? I'm -- I'm not clear at all about what we're doing here, and I'm not sure that I accept the premise of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

# SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, most rate matters are determined, initially, by the Illinois Commerce Commission, under current law. For a reason which, as I indicated, I do not know the history of, there is one circumstance in which it does not provide for initial determination of rates by the Commerce Commission, and I could read the whole sentence. Basically, it requires that when, as I indicated, there are rates which involve a - charges to customers outside of a municipality by a water utility owned, or owned and operated by a municipal corporation. In the current law, those rates are determined either by agreement, or in case of dispute, they are to be fixed by the circuit court of the county. Supreme Court suggested to us that it is more appropriate for rate determination, initially, to be done by the agency which does it

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

in all other circumstances, which is the Illinois Commerce Commission. So, in no way would it have any effect on your initial premise, which is what if we elected a Commerce Commission. I don't think that has anything to do with this. This has to do just with who would be looking at the matter, initially.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Macdonald.

#### SENATOR MACDONALD:

Then it has nothing to do with disputes after the fact? It has nothing to do then with -- with subsequent disputes that might go to the courts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

No. Any matter that is determined by the Commerce Commission, under its jurisdiction, is always subject, eventually, to being reviewed by a court. The only difference is that here, the matter for some reason, goes into the court first, instead of going before the Commerce Commission. And so, this I think is a relatively simple matter of substituting the initial determination by the Commerce Commission, rather than a circuit court.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Will the sponsor yield for a question? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

I have another -- a number of municipalities who are presently supplying water outside their limits. And, obviously, they charge more if they supply that water, because, frankly, they are the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

ones that have to put in the pipes and -- and perform the service, and what have you, sort of above and beyond what the municipal taxes call for. Now, if we take this down to the Commerce Commission, you're going to get that thing so - the Commerce Commission's got enough work as it is. And -- and believe me, there are a lot of municipalities in this State that are doing just exactly what I'm saying. You're going to get that Commerce Commission so overloaded. If they can go to the local court and get that dispute settled in a local court, the court at least some idea of -- of the territory. And it just seems to me that although the Supreme Court may, in effect, say they don't want the job, I don't think we ought to dump it on the -- on the Commerce Commission either. I think you're just going to overload them, and we'll never get anything done there. It's bad enough as is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

# SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, I would join with you Senator, as a former Mayor, and I think that - I'm surprised that Geo hasn't got up on this one. But, under no circumstance have I ever known a -- a water operation, in any municipality, to come under the ICC. I -- I think that it belongs in the courts. Very seldom are there disputes, and if there are disputes, I -- I think it should remain as is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rea.

#### SENATOR REA:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch you have successfully lit up the board. Senator -- indicates she will yield. Senator Rea.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR REA:

Senator, I -- I apologize to you. I was off the Floor for some of the earlier discussion. But, in my district I have an inner city water system that supplies over fifty communities over - over fifty municipalities, and does this mean that with those municipalities that would be selling to other municipalities, or to other water districts, because they buy from the centralized system, and then many times they will sell to other municipalities or water districts, would this apply to them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

If I understood your question, Senator Rea. First of all, you should be clear that in the existing Statute - and I'm not changing that. It is provided that this circumstance can be -can be determined by agreement of the parties. And from what --Senator Jacobs and some of the others are saying, that The only thing that is being changed here is usually happens. where there is a dispute that is not settled by the parties, it goes into a Circuit Court or to the Commerce Commission. And the point that the court was making, is courts do not really have the kind of expertness that helps them to know how to determine fair returns, and all of the other components of a utility charge. The Commerce Commission does know So I -- I if there's agreement, nobody at all is involved, if there's not, it would be the Commission rather than the circuit court.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rea.

#### SENATOR REA:

Yes. What about -- say that you add a new community -- a new municipality to the already existing system, would this effect it

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

any differently?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

Yeah. To the best of my knowledge, it would not, unless there was, again, a disagreement about the rates to be charged. Again, where the parties reach agreement, which I gather is what happens in most cases, there is no effect at all from this bill. It is simply where they -- they cannot reach agreement, and somebody has to arbitrate it. And all this is suggesting is that the commission knows more about how to set rates than does a court, because that's what it's designed for. That's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator Netsch, would this have any impact, whatsoever, on a private sector water company delivering water to a municipality?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

#### SENATOR NETSCH:

My advisor says no, it does not, and I think that is correct.

I'm not aware how it could.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

Presently, the Commerce Commission is not in the rate setting business with private sector water companies. And I -- I just want to be sure that this would not put them in the process of a

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

possibility of rate setting on those private sector water companies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

This applies to municipally - owned utilities only.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have an apparent conflict of interest, being a Mayor. However, I agree with Senator Jacobs. I feel that we should leave things as they are. I think in - court it's going to get the same type of evidence from both sides. It's closer to the scene of what's -- what's happening, and I think rather than give it to the Commerce Commission, because they've got plenty to do as it is, I think we should let well enough alone. And therefore, I speak against this bill. I feel the court's more qualify to do it, anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Barkhausen.

# SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Yes, Mr. President and Members. I rise in support of this bill. I think the recommendation makes good sense. I had a dispute that arose several years ago and may, for all I know, be an ongoing difference of opinion between a municipally owned water system and the unincorporated area around it that I represent. understand that the ICC is not terribly interested in having this responsibility vested in them. But I would submit that it makes sense that those who are otherwise expert in trying to determine what utility rates ought to be, should also have responsibility. Ultimately, of course, a party can appeal to the circuit court if they are not satisfied with the rate

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

granted by the Illinois Commerce Commission. And that would, I assume, remain the case under this legislation. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Netsch may close. SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. I didn't realize this was such a controversial issue. I -- I think it is relatively simple. The -- it apparently arises in a relatively small number of circumstances. And all the bill suggests, is that where there is a dispute, that cannot be resolved by the parties, involving this limited set of circumstances, that the agency which we have created to know about how to set all kinds of utility rates, including water rates, should be the one that gets the first crack at it. And that is really all the bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 823 pass? Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, the Ayes are 21, the Nays are 27, 2 voting Present. 823. having failed to receive the constitutional majority, is declared lost. 828. Senator 829. Senator Jacobs. 830. Senator O'Daniel. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, middle of Page 35, Senate Bill 830, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 830.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator O'Daniel.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. What Senate Bill 830 does, it permits - authorizes emergency firefighting equipment and ambulances to use to studded tires from November 15 through April 1st. If -- any questions, I'll attempt to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. A couple of comments, This would allow for firefighting then possibly a question. vehicles and ambulances to have studded tires between November 15th and April 1st. I realize these are emergency vehicles, and The Department of maybe there's some justification for this. Transportation is opposed to it, as are the Township Officials, and the County Superintendents of Highway primarily, because of what they do to the -- to the roads. They literally tear them up, and the situations that we have now, with a lot of the units with local government, is ones in which they do not have the money to And we're hearing from all of our people in repair the roads. regard to that. So, that's -- that's an issue that should be of And from what I understand, also, these type of tires are only really good in about one percent of the time. Only when there's really a high degree of ice, are these effective. So, really the impact that they would have would be negligible. The but the impact that they have on the road conditions and the road - the condition of the roads, themselves, could be very negative. So, I think we ought to take a hard look at this, and -- and I realize what we're trying to do here, but really, maybe this isn't a good idea, and it's one that we ought to reject. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I think you need need to take double look at this bill. 'Cause one of the things which wasn't discussed - that in the Federal Transportation Study, studded tires increase, not decrease, -- increase -- the stopping distance. In other words, the longer it takes you to stop on dry pavement - on bare pavement, which you're running probably eighty-five percent of the time, or better, in Illinois. Dry pavement increases that stopping distance twenty-seven percent. Now, you all know emergency vehicles tend to crowd their luck when they're going through any intersection, anyway, -- particularly one that have lights in it. And this increases their stopping distance for that much, by the use of these tire. I don't think it's good judgment. I would urge all of you to take a hard look at this bill, then vote No with the opposition. And what it will do damage to the township roads, that we already have enough trouble trying to keep passable, as it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel, may close. SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, we -- we allow these studded tires to be used - for mail carriers to use them on rural roads. Is it more important to get you're mail, or is it more important to save someone's residence, or -- or an ambulance to -- to save a life? And I'm sure there's no documented proof that these things hurt the road at all. You know the Department of Transportation now even goes out and grooves roads. You know, there - this is a lot of baloney, really, this is supported by the Association of Fire Protection Districts, and this isn't going to damage the road. You know, our roads out here they'll deteriorate from the use of salt, and things like this, long before some vehicle out here - emergency vehicle using a studded tire. And

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

you know, most rural areas and small municipalities don't have the funds to clean the ice and snow off of the side streets, and all, and — and this — there's is nothing wrong with this piece of legislation. The Governor vetoed the same bill last year, and I might read what he — what his rationale was. It says his rationale was "that the value of additional traction or braking effort afforded by studded tires was considerably outweighed by the potential for accidental death, or injury, and cost caused by the resulting of pavement damage." That's — that's a very poor excuse, I think. This is a good piece of legislation. It isn't going to damage the roads. Anyone that knows any thing about a road that a studded tire on a emergency vehicle they aren't out there that much. And I think it's a good piece of legislation. It should be passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 830 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 33, the Nays are 21, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 8-3-0, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are really bogging down here. We're going to have to pick up the pace. We've only got eight hundred more to go. All right. Senator Jacobs, on 837. Senate Bill 837, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 837.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you, Mr. President. This is strictly a vehicle bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 837 pass? Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are 1, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 837, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd reading is Senate Bill 838, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 838.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What this bill does, is establish a -- a rate, to be set by the commission, for meetings held by building commissions. And that is to be set -- the rate is to be set by the commission, and not to total more than thirty-six hundred dollars a year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Watson.

# SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

What's the compensation now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

SENATOR JACOBS:

There is none.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

This is a pay raise, then, of thirty-six hundred dollars a year for those commissioners?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Correct. In some cases they do pay them, but that's strictly a, you know, do as you can. But in -- in -- in this particular case, most of these meetings are held during the day, and we feel that they should be entitled to some reimbursement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Where -- where are these commissions located?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Normally they're created because this legislature chose to ensure that everyone had to build new prisons and new jails. And in the building of the new jails, almost all of them went to a building commission, in order to get the job done. So, we're just trying to accommodate most of those building commissions that come around due to that. I know Rock Island County has one. I know that Springfield has one. A lot of the communities, that are building county jails, have building commissions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator. I know there are some rather long-standing building commissions around the State. I have one in Whiteside County. I think those people have always served without pay. Do I understand now that you're going to mandate that they're paid at least three hundred dollars, and could be paid as much as thirty-six hundred dollars; is that - do I understand that correctly?

END OF TAPE

TAPE 7

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

What I -- what I am saying, is that it is up to the County Board to establish what that rate may be. And that it shouldn't be more than thirty-six hundred dollars a year. So, there is a possibility, if they have fifty meetings a year, then you would have to divide thirty-six hundred by fifty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

But does it also require that they be paid at least three hundred dollars per meeting?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## SENATOR JACOBS:

No. That's one of the problems we had. We had around three amendments trying to come up with some way of saying this, no. It just says that no more than thirty-six hundred dollars a year. That rate will be established by the commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Sorry to belabor this, but does it set a minimum? Or does it simply say that they must be paid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

The -- the wording is that - now let's get it here. Let me find the amendment. "Shall be entitled to compensation at a rate set by the commission not to exceed thirty-five hundred dollars a year." I don't know what else to tell you, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Davidson

### SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Davidson.

## SENATOR DAVIDSON:

You mentioned county board; does this bill affect any other building commissions which is not created by the County Board?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

As I understand it, it is -- it is for any public building commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Davidson.

## SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, since you did you mention my town. No one on the building commission - 'cause we do have one, it's been in existence for thirty years, so it was created by the City of Springfield. No one's asked for any such compensation or consideration thereto. And I think this is a very good reason that this bill should just not make it out of here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Holmberg.

#### SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Senator Jacobs, I know one of the things we mentioned in committee was whether there was an ending time. I think one thing that does happen, sometimes with building commissions, is that after there job is done, they still continue to operate. Is there any time at which this stops?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

I would hope, Senator Holmberg, that any building commission that would allow itself just to perpetuate, and to continue to pay, just for the sake of paying, would be doing a disservice. There is no ending point in the bill, however.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Jacobs may close.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Just ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 838 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

question, the Ayes are 11, the Nays are - I beg your pardon, the Ayes are 9, the Nays are 40, none voting Present. Senate Bill 838, having failed to received the required constitutional majority, is declared lost. 840. Senator Hall. 843. Senator Fawell. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 843, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 843.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

## SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is a very simple bill. It merely raises the fee for mailing notice to a punitive father from a dollar and a half, to two dollars plus the cost of certified mail. And it creates a twenty-five dollar - for filing rejection of an arbitration award. This has been requested by the Circuit Clerks' Association, so that their costs are covered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Welch.

## SENATOR WELCH:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Welch.

### SENATOR WELCH:

This says it applies to certain counties. What counties, and does this also cover workers compensation awards?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

It -- it covers counties of a million or less, and it really

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

is - it amends the Clerks of Courts Act and the Adoption Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch. All right. No further discussion? Senator Fawell, you may close.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I merely ask for your Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 843 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 30, Nays are 15, none voting Present. Senate Bill 843, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 844. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 844, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 844.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This time I'll hit my Yes vote instead of my speakers vote. This -- this amends the Clerks of the Courts Act and it -- it is an agreed bill now. It allows local governments -- or tells local governments that they've got to start paying for their civil law cases.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

I didn't understand your explanation at all, Senator. Would you please do it again?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. What -- what's happening is, in some of the municipalities the clerks have been having some problems when the lawyers come in and they hand them a hundred and fifty water bills and say, "make up cases for all of these, send out the notices." Then the people come in and pay their water bills, and instead of collecting the clerks' fee, all they're doing is saying is "we'll dismiss the case." The clerks are saying, "quit doing that or -- or at least collect our fee." It is costing the clerks a considerable amount of money. Same thing is true with -- with other small civil cases. One of the examples they gave was a -- a lawyer came in and he had fifty-five counts -- fifty-five lawsuits he could have done it with one lawsuit with the fifty-five counts.

He dismissed fifty-four of them. All they're trying to do is collect their money back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator, aren't they obligated, under the Statute, to perform that service?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

What the -- what the municipalities have agreed to is -- and there is an amendment to this bill -- which, in effect, limits it to -- to those kinds of bills. And the amendment says that they

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

will enforce criminal - or they will not have to pay for enforcing criminal or quasi-criminal laws or ordinances, including without limitation administration search warrants. What I am saying is, it -- what we're talking about, Senator Dunn, is civil cases. Are the clerks required - are the courts required to pick up that kind of a cost? Under the present law - yes. What they're trying to do is change the law, so that the clerks and the taxpayers will no have to -- no longer have to pay for these things.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well Senator, did I understand you to say that a lawyer will walk in with forty or fifty of these cases and ask -- and you wish now that they all be joined as one complaint, for all these defendants?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

All there're asking for is that when they collect, for instance, the water bill, they collect the court costs. What's happening is they are dismissing the cases without collecting the court costs. That's all they're asking for.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Who does the lawyer work for that's doing this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

The municipalities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dunn.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### SENATOR T. DUNN:

Why don't they tell their lawyer what to do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Because under the present law, they don't have to. I'm sure, with this law in place, they will tell them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Hawkinson.

### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, how do you define local government in your bill? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

## SENATOR FAWELL:

It's -- there is no definition of local government in the bill. It's just -- its the Statute according to local government. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson.

## SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Well, I was afraid that's what you were going to answer, because county government is also local government. And since you only exempt law enforcement agencies, if the zoning department or the county clerk has a suit for failure to register a dog, or something like this, you're going to have the county taxing the county, and I -- I'm just not sure that this makes a lot of sense. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Fawell, you may close. SENATOR FAWELL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

What the clerks are trying to do is an attempt - have the court costs picked up by those who should be paying them. Those are the people that are paying the bills. Right now, if a -- a -- somebody comes into the recorders office, he pays a fee. If somebody comes into any other county office, he pays a fee. Why in the world shouldn't a municipality who wants the court to, in effect, be their bill collector, not pay the fee. All we're asking, is that instead of allowing the taxpayers to have to pick up this cost, have the person who owes the money pay the court fee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 844 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all vished to reconsider? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 11, the Nays are 42, the Presents are 1. Senate Bill 844, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared lost. Bottom of Page 35. Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 848. Senator Welch. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 848.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

## SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 848, clarifies that Environmental Reclamation Liens do not have preference over the rights of bonafide purchasers, mortgagees or other prior lien holders. It was intended that this was the law would be when we passed the Environmental Reclamation Lien Law, last year. There

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

has been some confusion among some title companies, in the State, and they have asked that there be some clarification. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed this particular bill, and has no objections to it. I would move for passage of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 848 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 55, the Nays are none, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 848, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of Page 36. 850. Senator Madigan. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, top of Page 36, is Senate Bill 8-5-0. Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 850.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Madigan.

## SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 850 is another bill that was on the Agreed Bill List. However, this bill does create the State Fur Bearer Stamp, the Fur Bearer Stamp Fund and Fur Bearer Stamp Committee. Allocates those funds to be generated, fifty percent to the Department of Conservation for developing and improving Illinois habitat management areas, thirty-five percent to not-for-profit groups, and fifteen percent for a Department of Conservation-approved trapping education program. The genesis of this bill comes from the Illinois Trappers Association themselves. And I would be glad to try to

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 850 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. opposed, 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 55, the Nays are none, none voting Senate Bill 850, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. 852. Senator Senator Karpiel. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 855, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 855.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpiel.

## SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 855 requires that the DCFS regulations, concerning local boards — the local fifteen hundred board in DuPage County — that in order to receive recognition by the Department, private providers must represent — or their representatives must represent at least twenty-five percent of the local board's membership. That's all it does.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 855 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 855, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Reading is Senate Bill 860. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 860.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill as -- as indicated, prohibits the liquor supplier from canceling, or failing to renew a contract with a wholesaler, unless done in good faith. This is a fairness doctrine bill and I'm -- stand ready to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 860 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 24 -- 25, the Nays are 19, 8 voting Present. Senate Bill 860, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared lost. Senator Jacobs has requested Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration. 861. Senator O'Daniel. Senator O'Daniel, on the Floor. All right. 864. Senator Carroll. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 864, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 864.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. When we created, under the Horse Racing Act, the Tax Allocation Fund, two-sevenths of that money was to go for actual promotion of horse racing throughout the State - through all the various tracks that are within the State. Many of us felt last year, and had discussed the idea, and caused me to introduce the bill, with several cosponsors, that the appropriate agency to, in fact, promote the breeding and racing of horses, would be the Department of Agriculture. And that it be given to varying people around the State, who understand the breeding industry and racing industry, and the various tracks throughout the State. Lo and behold, we should have done it last year. We found, instead, that a a half dollars have gone to one contractor. One contractor, who is the former Director of the Lottery, as opposed to spending this money as I think we had intended it to be spent, and that is around Illinois, through various contractors throughout Illinois who understand the promotion of racing and promotion of horse breeding and racing as an industry. This bill would say that it has to go through the Department of Agriculture, which I believe is the better depositor of those issues, and understands and that it cannot go to one individual contractor, be he a director or not. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 864 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 Ayes, 13 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 864, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, the middle of Page 36, is Senate Bill 865. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 865.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

### SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and Members of Senate. What this bill does is upon certification by a physician that a person's in a terminal state or a qualifying disease, which is -- would be terminal as determined by the Director of Insurance, the policy holder or the insurance company could make payment of one-fourth the value fo the policy, to the policy holder. The money is going to be paid, this just gives that person who is in that terminal state an opportunity to get some of the money back to do with what they need, in the way of either care, or some enjoyment before they pass on. I'd appreciate a favorable vote.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Senator Collins.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

Sorry. Question of the sponsor.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Collins.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

Does the patient have a choice in this?

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

### SENATOR DAVIDSON:

It is strictly up to the policy holder. It's their option, if they don't want to take the payment they don't have to. It's not a required, it's their option. This is to follow up what we did a year or two ago when we -- we gave a change in the law, which is

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

now law that if you have a life policy, and in long-term care you can get some advance payment to help pay your medical expense. This is strictly up to the option of the policy holder. It has the support of the insurance industry.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. Of course I stand in support of the bill. I think we ought to make sure we don't have a misunderstanding about what we're doing here though. This bill would allow insurance companies to sell policies that have this benefit. This would not necessarily mean that everybody's insurance policy is going to have the benefit in it. So what this does is allow this kind of insurance to be sold in Illinois and it is a trend that is growing around the country and it's one that we here in Illinois will be able to participate in now.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I think -- I would just make a suggestion. If we're going to allow this - and I don't think it has to be done at this time in this bill - but if we're going to authorize this - as I understand it, let me just ask you a question first. This bill will authorize this kind of policy to be issued in the future, is that correct?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

As I understand it's correct, you can't make it retroactive. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Then -- then let me say that we ought to think about - and perhaps in the House, what I think we want to prevent is for example, the hospital taking a required assignment of this benefit before they'll except the person at that stage of his illness in order to collect a bill that they might not otherwise be able to collect. I -- I just think that this kind of option has to be safeguarded from being taken advantage of by people that we don't intend to be the beneficiary of this option. I just suggest that to you, as the bill moves along.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Davidson, you wish to close?

## SENATOR DAVIDSON:

I'd just appreciate a favorable vote and on suggestion on what Senator Berman said, we'll certainly discuss it with him and the Department of Insurance and the life insurance industry, and ask the House sponsor to consider the amendment.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The question is, shall Senate Bill 865 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, 2 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 865, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 866. Senator Netsch. 867. 868. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, the middle of Page 36, is Senate Bill 868. Madam Secretary, read the bill, please.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 8-6-8.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

Senator Netsch.

### SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 868 is the Fair Campaign Practices Act. It is a modest attempt to deal with what, I think we all believe, has become a major problem of political campaigning these days. And that is the ugliness, the negativism, the occasional innuendos, and other practices, which I think of us believe we have been subjected to, and many of us, in fact, What the bill does is to provide that every political committee, whether it's dealing with an issue, or with a candidacy, will be given a copy of a proposed Code of Fair Campaign Practices. The text of which is set out in the bill; and will be given an opportunity, voluntarily, to sign it, if the head of that committee so chooses. There is no enforcement mechanism directly built into the bill, and that is quite deliberate. are serious first amendment questions -- there are serious first amendment questions whenever you begin to try to put any restraints on what can be done during the course of a political campaign. My feeling and my hope, and actually my expectation, is that if this is in place - this Code of Fair Campaign Practices that candidates and political committees, excuse me, will feel that they should sign the Code, even though it is a voluntary Act. And I think that as time goes by, more and more will, indeed, sign If the candidate, or political committee, does subscribe to the Code, they get, in effect, a bonus. Because they are then allowed to indicate, on their political literature, that they are subscribers to the Code of Fair Campaign Practices. The Code sets out standards of conduct for the -- for the conduct of a campaign that, I think, all of us would believe ought to be adhered to by anyone running for office, or supporting a proposition. emphasize the fact that subscribing to the code is voluntary, which I think is a requirement of the First Amendment.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

it is a step - an important step-in the right direction, even though it is not, totally, going to solve the campaign -- the problem of -- of negative and distorting campaigns. But I think it does address - begin to address - a problem that all of us feel very strongly about. I would be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Discussion? Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. A few questions of the sponsor. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Netsch, if -- if this Code of Fair Campaign Practice bill is unenforceable, then why are we introducing it here in the Senate? Shouldn't the more appropriate place - have it given through the organizations -- the local organizations, like -- as you know, in Chicago, we have the organization known as CONDUCT. They have documents which they disburse to various candidates and they -- the candidates are requested to sign these codes, and pledge to adhere to them. Aren't we going a little off base by trying to introduce a -- a Senate bill.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch.

## SENATOR NETSCH:

I don't think so, Senator Dudycz. I think that there's a vast difference between what we can do by passing a law that does two things; one, it expresses our commitment to the principle that campaigns ought to be conducted fairly and decently, and that becomes, in effect, a matter of State policy. Secondly, while there is at least one group that exists, in -- that it's sort of self-formed, in Chicago, called CONDUCT; it has no authority and I -- to the best of my knowledge, has actually not circulated and

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

asked people to subscribe to any particular code. It is true that on several occasions CONDUCT has suggested that a candidate has stepped beyond the bounds of propriety. But I don't think there's any pre-commitment that it has the authority, or even has attempted to exercise the authority, to impose on candidates by giving them a code to sign before hand. So I think we can do something legislatively, that the voluntary groups cannot do.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dudycz.

## SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, Senator, what you're saying then, with this law, you're saying that we are giving a commitment to fair campaign practices. And you're also saying that, in the absence of this law, that we are -- we are not having that commitment towards fair campaign practices. Well, let me ask you this, if an opponent signs a pledge, which is written in a more astringent standard than the current laws of libel and slander, could this pledge be used as a -- as a contract in a court of law?

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch.

## SENATOR NETSCH:

If I heard your question, did you say, could it be used as a contract in a court of law? Yeah. No.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dudycz.

## SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, I don't think that -- I applaud your -- your intent, Senator, but I don't think this is the way we should go. I don't think that we should be legislating a code of conduct in this manner. I think that the organizations, like we have in Chicago, the organization known as CONDUCT is -- is a better way to go at it. And I stand in opposition of your bill.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

## SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think the sponsor has good intentions, but it all depends on the individual person campaigning. I've always made it a practice, never to even mention my opponent's name, never attack them, they want to attack me, be my guest, cause I always say, "attack issues and not people." I don't feel we can legislate conduct. It's just like trying to legislate morality, you can't do that either. And much as I applaud your efforts, Dawn, this is -- I don't feel this is the way to do it. People are going to be vicious, and when they are, so I sign a pledge and I can't open up my mouth, that's not fair. How will I be able to show where they're wrong. I feel it's a little bit one sided, and therefore, I'm going to vote Present, although I am for fair campaign tactics. I practice them myself, but I don't feel this is the way to do it.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

## SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I don't know -exactly what a good vote on this bill is. I -- I suspect a
present vote might be a good one, because we all have a conflict
of interest. This, and several other bills, are a series of bills
which are designed to make elected offices in this State
hereditary. I think that, frankly, as an incumbent, I suppose we
ought to be for this, because, obviously, the people that are most
likely to bring charges in an election are the challengers. I
suppose now if I vote for, or if I vote against, an income tax
proposal, that my opponent can quickly charge me for doing one or
the other. And then I can quickly bring my opponent up on some

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

sort of a charge. And it'll become a PR game, if not a legal game. I don't think that the people who wrote the Illinois Constitution - Senator Netsch was there, perhaps she has a clearer perception than I - meant these offices to be hereditary. I think they meant them to be elected in a give-and-take election campaign in which the challengers were able to bring the issues forward. Frankly, incumbents have plenty of advantages already, if they're smart enough to use them. I don't think we want to get to the point where - like our friends in Congress - there are more members of the Soviet Politburo defeated in Russia, than there are Members of the Illinois General Assembly. I don't think we want to be held to that standard.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

## SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Keats.

## SENATOR KEATS:

Dawn, this is not a harassing question. I'm going to use a real life example. In thirteen years I don't think I've ever mentioned an opponent by name, other than a friendly hello. Eighty-six - I get a mailing that hits the Saturday and the Monday before the election. The only thing they didn't call me was a child molester, but they did intimate that I was one. That was about the only thing they didn't say. It was a fairly rough piece of mail. To call me a crook would have improved the mail. What -- what does this allow me to do, since it hits the Saturday and the Monday, direct mail, right before an election? Luckily my constituency said, "what a stupid mailing" and I won by the most I've ever won by. Maybe being called a crook and a child molester is a benefit, I don't know. But what -- what does this,

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

mechanically, do, when that mail arrives Saturday and Monday, on a Tuesday election, with facts that are just blatant lies?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Netsch.

### SENATOR NETSCH:

I don't think it totally solves that problem, Senator Keats, and I've not represented that it does. For those of us — and you — you do not stand alone in that respect — who have been hit by a weekend before the election ugly piece of campaign literature. I'm not sure that we have any defense except, hopefully, the relationship we've established with our constituents, that will allow them to discount something like that. What this is intended to do, really, is to — is to create an atmosphere and a self-imposed, self-generated, pressure, that starts before that weekend before the election, in which — if you subscribe to it and it — it — you get a chance to say so on your literature — and over a period of time — and I'm not saying immediately — I think it's going to help change the moral tone of campaigns.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

#### \_\_\_\_\_

Further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Netsch, you wish to close?

## SENATOR NETSCH:

Briefly, I just wanted to address two things that Senator Schaffer said. One is, that I don't think there's any conflict, when you're talking about fairness and decency and how campaigns are conducted. And secondly, the whole point - if you read the Code, Senator Schaffer, - the whole point is, you are to have every opportunity in the world to be as tough about issues as you choose. It is only when you start calling your -- your opponent - or the issue, as it may be, - names that are -- that raise prejudices that are untrue, that is when we begin to violate this. All of us have been complaining about the moral content of recent

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

campaigns. This, at least, is a step in the right direction.
PRESIDENT ROCK:

The question is, shall Senate Bill 868 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 9 voting Nay, 14 voting Present. Senate Bill 8-6-8, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 872. 877. 878 was on the Recall. 879. Senator Watson. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 879. Read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 8-7-9.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 879 does exactly what the Calendar says. It requires the Health Maintenance Organization Guarantee Association to reimburse hospitals for legally mandated care provided to enrollees of an insolvent organization. This particular legislation is introduced on behalf of the Hospital Association, and Senator Rea and myself have had hospitals who have been impacted, in regard to HMO's, who have -- belly up. And what we've done here is simply say that the hospitals will be reimbursed only for legally mandated care, and that's defined as health care that is expressly obligated pursuant to federal or State law. And we're simply adding hospitals for that legally mandated care. In the legislation, following such -- such contractual obligations that are needed to be paid to the covered individuals from the HMO, and also that the

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

current law says that it must make payments to providers of health care, so as to assure the continuity of care. So we're just asking that hospitals be considered along with other providers. I'd be glad to answer any questions, otherwise I would certainly appreciate your support.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, question is, shall Senate Bill 879 pass. Those in favor will vote Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take wish? the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none Senate Bill 879, having received the required voting Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. 8-8-3 is a hold, the sponsor informs the Chair. 8-8-4. Senator Watson. Senator Watson. 8-8-4. Top of Page 37. 8-8-5. 8-8-7. Senator Any in that series you wish to call? Okay. Ladies and Valle. Gentlemen, top of Page 37, and we will be adjourning shortly. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 8-8-9. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 8-8-9.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator del Valle.

## SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 889 attempts to assist in the enforcement and collection of child support when the responsible parent leaves the country. The bill also aids a custodial parent if a child is abducted and taken to another country. It adds information that has to be given by a person who is not a U.S. citizen. I ask for a favorable roll call.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the guestion shall Senate Bill 8-8-9 pass. Those in favor. vote Ave. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Senate Bill 8-8-9, having received the Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order Senate Bills 3rd Reading, middle of the Page is Senate Bill 895. Read the bill. This will be our last bill, by the way. everybody was waiting around to go to one thousand. Well, another day.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 895.

(Secretary reads title of the bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator del Valle.

## SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 895 adds as a restricted driving permit. The permit for one year to allow individuals to get from home to a course of instruction at an accredited education institution.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 895 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 895, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. Senator Philip and I

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

have conferred a good part of the afternoon and we will have, on your desks tomorrow, a proposed Agreed Bill List, representing some two hundred and seventy bills, that every Member — the list will be on your desk along with the the agreed procedure, in terms of voting, or knocking bills off, or whatever. We will go in tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock. 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. I'm sure you are aware that a very dear friend of all of ours passed away suddenly, and he was a great State employee, and a great human being, and his funeral is at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. So we will commence at ten. Leo Fitzgerald died this weekend. A long-time employee of the Secretary of State — various Secretaries of State and State Treasurer, and just a wonderful human being. So we will commence at ten o'clock tomorrow morning, and work, probably, until around the same time, maybe a little later. I'm sorry. Senator Watson.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Just a point of personal privilege.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Just, yeah - in the mean time, all we have remaining are some housekeeping pieces of paper. We did a good day's work. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR WATSON:

Well. Thank you, Mr. President. Once again the House of Representatives has issued a challenge in a softball game and — and June 13 — get'em, right, get'em — June 13 has been scheduled for the game. So we've got to get ourselves together. We got to get ourselves organized, as always in the past, we've been able to do that, on several different nights before the game. And so, Thursday night, we're going to have a practice. So I know that all of you'll want to be there, so bring your tennis shoes and whatever you need, and we'll have a practice Thursday evening. Thank you.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Also, I would ask the Members to take a look - the schedule is being passed out - distributed for the remainder of May, including the suggested committee time slots -- and June, obviously. And also, October, so that all of us who have plans for the Fall, make our plans accordingly. We will come back in October - on the fourth of October to receive the Veto Messages, and then be in Session the requisite six days - the 17th, 18th and 19th, Halloween and November 1st and 2nd. So the schedule is being -has been distributed. I'd ask, particularly, the chairmen and minority spokesmen of the respective committees to take a hard look at the committee schedule. We have attempted to schedule and afford all the committees an opportunity to meet at least twice, so that we can handle the -- the volume of House Bills that I'm sure are not only here, but will be coming over. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

### SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President. To remind the Republican Members, we're having a Republican Caucus in my office at 9:00 a.m. Coffee and.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Severns, for purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

## SENATOR SEVERNS:

I -- I would just, frankly, like to take a moment to correct the record from debate yesterday, where I inadvertently referred to debate on Senate Bill 107 that occurred, rather than 449 as I reported. And I'd like to have to record corrected.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

The record will so reflect. Committee Reports, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senators Demuzio and D'Arco, co-chairmen of the Senate Committee on Assignment of Bills, refers the following bills to committee; Agriculture and Conservation, House Bill 1401; Appropriations II, House Bill 592; Commerce and Development, House Bills 1266 and 2436; Elementary and Secondary Education, House Bills 62 and 1619; Energy and Environment, House Bills 1003 and 1356; Executive, House Bills 316, 1159, 1207, 1416, 1569, 1745, 1768, 2032, 2427, 2629; Finance, House Bills 1778, 1891, 2383; Higher Education, House Bills 879 and 1577; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activity, House Bills 1553, 1699, 2351; Judiciary, House Bills 37, 642, 776, 813, 1107, 2428; Local Government, House Bills 274, 379, 548, 1278, 1309 pardon me -- 1305, 1429, 2321; Public Health Welfare and Corrections, House Bills 304, 1269, 2528, 2649; Transportation, House Bills 873 and 2100. I have a like report regarding House -the assignment of bills to Agriculture and Conservation, House Bill 886; Elementary and Secondary Education, House Bills 644 and Energy and Environment, House Bill 799; Executive, House Bills 103, 115, 1225, 2031, 2333, 2665; Higher Education, House Bill 1203; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities, House Bills 1385, 1423, 1671, 2737; Judiciary, House Bills 458, 895 -pardon me -- 985, 1097, 2314; Labor, House Bill 2345; Local Government, House Bills 1255 and 2599; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections, House Bills 1244, 2439; Revenue, House Bills 490, 2485 and 2487; Transportation, House Bills 522, 1051 and 1616. Filed by Senators Demuzio and D'Arco, co-chairmen of Senate Committee on Assignment of Bills. ... (machine cutoff)...

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Resolutions, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 333 offered by Senator Mahar.

Senate Resolution 334 offered by Senator Mahar.

Senate Resolution 335 offered by Senators Demuzio, Vadalabene, President Rock and all Members.

Senate Resolution 336 offered by Senator Kelly.

Senate Resolution 337 offered by Senator Kustra.

Senate Resolution 338 offered by Senators Keats and Kustra.

They're all congratulatory.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 339 offered by Senators Hawkinson, Luft, Keats and all Members.

Senate Resolution 340 offered by Senators Demuzio, President Rock and all Members.

Those are both death Resolutions.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 341 offered by Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 342 offered by Senator Kustra.

They're both substantive.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 67 offered by Senator Davidson and all Members.

It is -- pardon me -- I believe that's just Senator Davidson and it is substantive.

34th Legislative Day

May 23, 1989

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive. I'm sorry, Executive.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 68 offered by Senators Berman and del Valle.

It is also substantive.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive. ...(machine cutoff)... Any further business to come before the Senate? Any announcements? We will begin tomorrow, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, with the Order of Recalls, and move to 2nd Reading, including the Appropriation Bills, and then move on to 3rd Reading. 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. If there's no further business, Senator Demuzio moves that the Senate stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday. 10:00 tomorrow morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 23 + 1989		
HB-0103 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
H6-0115 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HE-0458 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HJ-0490 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
H6-0522 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HB-0644 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HU-0753 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HS-0799 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HU-0886 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
H3-0995 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
Hd-1051 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
Hd-1085 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HE-1039 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1097 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HU-1203 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
H3-1225 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HS-1244 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
H6-1235 FIRST REAUING	PAGE	3
HB-1385 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HJ-1423 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
H3-1616 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1671 FIRST READING HB-2031 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2314 FIKST READING	PAGE PAGE	4
H2-2333 FIRST READING	PAGE	4 4
HA-2345 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2439 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HU-2482 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
H3-2485 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
H3-2467 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2599 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
H3-2665 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
H8-2737 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-0003 SECONO READING	PAGE	46
SB-0006 RECALLED	PAG₺	5
SE-0010 SECOND READING	PAGE	46
S3-0022 SECOND READING	PAGE	46
S3-0038 RECALLED	PAGE	6
SA-0039 SECOND READING	PAGE	47
SB-0041 RECALLED	PAGE	7
S6-0048 RECALLED	PAGE	7
SA-0057 RECALLED	PAGE	8
SS-0059 RECALLED SB-0077 SECUND READING	PAGE	43
SB-0077 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	47 48
SD-0090 RECALLED	PAGE	43
S8-0093 SECOND READING	PAGE	48
SJ-0126 RECALLED	PAGE	9
S5-0131 RECALLED	PAGE	11
SB-0187 RECALLED	PAGE	13
S3-0210 SECOND READING	PAGE	49
Sb-0211 SECOND READING	PAGE	49
SH-0213 RECALLED	PAGE	14
SB-0223 SECOND READING	PAGE	50
SD-0227 SECOND READING	PAGE	51
S8-0233 SECOND READING	PAGE	53
SD-0234 SECOND READING	PAGE	53
SU-0238 SECOND READING	PAGE	54
SH-0239 SECOND READING	PAGE	54
Sb-0240 SECOND READING	PAGE	55
S3-0243 RECALLED S3-0253 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	44 55
SB-0258 SECOND READING	PAGE	57
SB-0255 SECOND READING	PAGE	57
SS SESS SCOOMS READING	TAGE	٠,

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

S3-0269	SECOND READING	PAGE	56
	SECOND READING	PAGE	56
	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
\$3-0290	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
Si-0296	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
S3-0321	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
S3-0344	SECOND READING	PAGE	60
\$3-0361	RECALLED	PAGE	16
S-0455	SECOND READING	PAGE	6 l
\$5-0458	SECOND READING	PAGE	61
\$3-0474	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
SE-0475	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
S&-0477	RECALLED	PAGE	16
SB-0438	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SE-0494	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SB-0500	SECOND READING	PAGE	65
S3-0511	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
SB-0513	THIRD READING	PAGË	137
Sa-0514	THIRD READING	PAGE	138
S3-0515	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
Sá-0517	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
\$3-0516	THIRD READING	PAGE	140
SJ-0519	THIRD READING	PAGE	140
Sb-0520	THIRD READING	PAGE	142
S6-0522	THIRD READING	PAGE	145
S5-0525	THIRD READING	PAGE	151
SE-0526	THIRD READING	PAGE	151
S5-0529	RECALLED	PAGE	17
SB-0531	SECOND READING	PAGE	67
S3-0533	SECOND READING	PAGE	67
SJ-0540	THIRD REAUING	PAGE	152
SS-0541	THIRD READING	PAGE	153
SB-0555	THIRD READING	PAGE	153
Sa-0557	SECOND READING	PAGE	68
S3-0559	SECOND READING	PAGE	69
	SECOND READING	PAGE	69
	THIRD READING	PAGE	154
	SECOND READING	PAGE	70
	THIRD READING	PAGE	154
	SECOND READING	PAGE	72
	THIRD READING	PAGE	155
	SECOND READING	PAGE	72
	SECOND READING	PAGE	73
	SECOND READING	PAGE	74
	RECALLED	PAGE	18
	THIRD READING	PAGE	160
	SECOND READING RECALLED	PAGE	74
		PAGE	19
	RECALLED SECOND READING	PAGE	19
	SECOND READING	PAGE	75 75
	SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	76
	SECOND READING	PAGE	76
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	161 162
	THIRD READING	PAGE	163
	RECALLED	PAGE	20
	THIRD READING	PAGE	164
	SECOND READING	PAGE	77
	THIRD READING	PAGE	168
	THIRD READING	PAGE	170
	THIRD READING	PAGE	172
	RECALLED	PAGE	23
	THIRD READING	PAGE	175

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 66TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

S	83-0630	SECOND READING	PAGE	78
S	88-0632	THIRD READING	PAGE	178
S	SB-0633	SECOND READING	PAGE	80
S	SJ-0634	THIRD READING	PAGE	178
		RECALLED	PAGE	24
		RECALLED	PAGE	24
		THIRD READING	PAGE	179
		RECALLED	PAGE	25
		THIRD READING	PAGE	180
		THIRD READING	PAGE	181
		THIRD READING	PAGE	181
		THIRD READING	PAGE	166
		THIRD READING	PAGE	187
		THIRD READING	PAGE	188
		THIRD READING	PAGE	205
		THIRD READING	PAGE	205
		THIRO READING	PAGE	205
		THIRD READING	PAGE	190
		THIRD READING	PAGE	191
		THIRD READING	PAGE	193
		THIRD READING	PAGE	196
		THIRD READING	PAGE	199
		THIRD READING	PAGE	200
		THIRD READING	PAGE	201
		THIRD READING	PAGE	202
		SECOND READING	PAGE	90
		THIRD READING SECOND READING	PAGE	205
		SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	82 32
		SECOND READING	PAGE	83
		THIRD READING	PAGE	206
		THIRD READING	PAGE	207
	33-0681		PAGE	210
		SECOND READING	PAGE	84
		THIRD READING	PAGE	211
		OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	212
		SECOND READING	PAGE	85
S	83-0685	RECALLED	PAGE	86
S	3640-E3	THIRD READING	PAGE	212
S	8860-88	THIRD READING	PAGE	213
5	55-0692	THIRD READING	PAGE	214
5	33-0694	SECOND READING	PAGE	85
5	35-0695	THIRD READING	PAGE	218
		THIRD READING	PAGE	219
		THIRD READING	PAGE	220
		THIRD READING	PAGE	228
		RECALLED	PAGE	26
		THIRD READING	PAGE	229
		OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	238
		THIRD READING	PAGE	239
		THIRD READING	PAGE	241
		RECALLED	PAGE	27
		THIRD READING	PAGE	243
		SECOND READING	PAGE	86
		THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	247 247
	SU-0724		PAGE PAGE	247
		THIRD READING	PAGE	257
	33-0726	THIRD READING	PAGE	257
	50-0727		PAGE	260
	50-0729		PAGE	263
	33-0731	THIRD REAUING	PAGE	267
		RECALLED	PAGE	29
		THIRD READING	PAGE	268
			_	

## STATE OF ILLINOIS BOTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DESATE INDEX

\$8-0734	THIRD READING	PAGE	269
\$3-0735	THIRD READING	PAGE	272
SB-0740	THIRD READING	PAGE	275
\$3-0741	THIRD READING	PAGE	277
SB-0742	THIRD READING	PAGE	277
Sb-0743	SECOND READING	PAGE	87
	SECOND READING	PAGE	90
	RECALLED	PAGE	28
SB-0747	THIRD READING	PAGE	280
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	284
	THIRD READING	PAGE	284
Sa-0753	THIRD READING	PAGE	266
	THIRD READING	PAGE	237
	THIRD READING	PAGE	287
	THIRD READING	PAGE	290
	SECOND READING	PAGE	91
	THIRD READING	PAGE	290
	SECUND READING	PAGE	88
	SECOND READING	PAGE	88
	RECALLED	PAGE	45
	SECOND READING	PAGE	89
	RECALLED	PAGE	29
	SECOND READING	PAGE	89
	SECOND READING	PAGE	89
	SECOND READING	PAGE	90
	SECOND READING	PAGE	91
	THIRD READING	PAGE	292
	THIRD READING	PAGE	296
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	298
	THIRD READING	PAGE	298
	THIRD READING	PAGE	299
	THIRD READING	PAGE	300
	SECOND READING	PAGE	92
	SECOND READING	PAGE	93
	SECOND READING	PAGE	94
	THIRD KEADING	PAGE	302
	THIRD READING	PAGE	304
	THIRD READING	PAGE	305
	THIRD READING	PAGE	306
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	311
	THIRD READING	PAGE	311
	THIRD READING	PAGE	318
	SECOND READING	PAGE	94
	SECOND READING	PAGE	95
	THIRD READING	PAGE	321
Sa-0838	THIRD READING	PAGE	322
\$3-0343	THIRD READING	PAGE	327
S3-0844	THIRD READING	PAGE	328
S8-0849	THIRD READING	PAGE	332
\$8-0850	THIRD READING	PAGE	333
Sa-0853	SECOND READING	PAGE	95
S3-0855	THIRD READING	PAGE	334
\$3-0856	SECOND READING	PAGE	96
\$3-0360	THIRD READING	PAGE	335
\$3-0864	THIRD READING	PAGE	335
SB-0865	THIRD READING	PAGE	337
	THIRD READING	PAGE	339
\$6-0870	SECOND READING	PAGE	97
S5-0873	RECALLED	PAGE	31
SB-0879	THIRD READING	PAGE	346
	THIRD READING	PAGE	347
S5-0894	TABLED	PAGE	97
SB-0895	THIRD READING	PAGE	348
\$3-0896	SECOND READING	PAGE	97

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

		1121 237 1707		
S	B-0900	RECALLED	PAGE	30
	6-0901	RECALLED	PAGE	32
	B-0904	SECOND READING	PAGE	98
	6-0907	SECOND READING	PAGE	98
	B-0911	SECOND READING	PAGE	98
	3-0918	SECOND READING	PAGE	100
	3-0936	SECOND READING	PAGE	100
	3-0938			
	d-0942		PAGE	101
		SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE	101
	B-0964		PAGE	101
		SECOND READING	PAGE	102
			PAGE	103
	B-0999		PAGE	104
	b-1004		PAGE	33
		SECOND READING	PAGE	104
	8-1007		PAGE	106
	8-1008		PAGE	106
		SECOND READING	PAGE	106
		SECOND READING	PAGE	107
		SECOND READING	PAGE	108
		SECOND READING	PAGE	110
		SECOND READING	PAGE	111
		SECOND READING	PAGE	111
		SECOND READING	PAGE	111
		SECOND READING	PAGE	112
		SECOND READING	PAGE	115
		RECALLED	PAGE	34
		RECALLED	PAGE	35
		SECUND READING	PAGE	116
	6-1072	SECOND READING	PAGE	116
	8-1093	SECONU READING	PAGE	117
	8-1095		PAGE	118
		SECOND READING	PAGE	118
		SECOND READING	PAGE	119
	6-1128		PAGE	119
		SECOND READING	PAGE	120
		RECALLED	PAGE	35
	B-1158		PAGE	120
	ä-1159		PAGE	121
	d-1167		PAGE	121
		SECOND READING	PAGE	122
	3-1171		PAGE	122
	3-1174	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
	3-1175	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
		SECOND READING	PAGE	123
	B-1181	SECOND READING	PAGE	124
	9-1162	SECOND READING	PAGE	124
		SECOND READING	PAGE	125
		RECALLED	PAGE	36
	6-1257		PAGE	125
	8-1271	SECOND READING	PAGE	126
	b-12ö6	SECOND READING	PAGE	127
		SECOND READING	PAGE	127
		RECALLED	PAGE	37
	E-1316	SECOND READING	PAGE	130
	o-1316	SECOND READING	PAGE	130
		SECOND READING	PAGE	131
	J-1335		PAGE	131
	B-1336	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
	8-1345	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
		RECALLED	PAGE	38
	8-1388		PAGE	39
	8-1412		PAGE	40
S	B-1420	RECALLED	PAGE	40

K	Ë	Ρ	0	R	Ţ	:	1	r	Ĺ	۶	L	DΑ	Υ	
ρ	À	G	Ε	:		0	ο.	,						

1 . .

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

91/03/21 15:45:38

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

SB-1431	RECALLED	PAGE	41
SB-1445	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
SB-1445	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
S3-1463	SECOND READING	PAGE	133
SR-0333	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
\$2-0334	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0335	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0336	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0337	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAG€	352
SR-0338	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0339	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0340	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0341	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SR-0342	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
SJR-0064	ADOPTED	PAGE	135
SJR-0067	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	352
8400-RL2	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	353
	SUBJECT MATTER		

PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	262
PAGE	351
PAGE	351
PAGE	353
	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE