104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of twelve-thirty having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Tom Christell, Grace Lutheran Church, Springfield, Illinois. Reverend.

THE REVEREND TOM CHRISTELL:

(Prayer by the Reverend Tom Christell)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Thank you, Reverend. Reading of the Journal, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Journal of Wednesday, May 6, 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

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. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Thursday, May the 7th and Tuesday, May 12th, in the year 1992, 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

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

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 bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bills 1495, 2653, 2847, 2882, 2945, 2958, 3030, 3089, 3104, 3105, 3134, 3139, 3149, 3153, 3184, 3191, 3210, 3247, 3261, 3331, 3351, 3379, 3394, 3417, 3485, 3513, 3516, 3555, 3675, 3676, 3686, 3773, 3785, 3824, 3848, 3904, 3921, 4105 and 4196.

Passed the House May 12, 1991.

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 adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 133.

Adopted by the House May, 7, 1992. It is designatory. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1252 offered by Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 1253 offered by Senator Carroll and all Members.

Senate Resolutions 1254 and 1255 offered by Senator Raica.

Senate Resolution 1256 offered by Senator Smith.

And Senate Resolution 1257 offered by Senator Dudycz.

They are all congratulatory.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. Ladies and Gentlemen, those within the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

sound of my voice, I would ask that you please join us on the Floor. We will consider the report of the Committee on Executive Appointments and then attempt, at least, to have a group picture taken, given the fact that so many of us will not be here next year. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments and Administration, to which was referred the Governor's Message of April 1, 1992, referred the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following Messages.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kellv.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I now move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in his Message of April 1, 1992. PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Kelly. 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. The Senate is now in Executive Session. Senator Kelly. SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Now, with respect to the Governor's Message of April 1, 1992, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be the Assistant Director of the Department of Insurance for a term ending January 18, 1993 - Madelynne Brown of Chicago.

To be the Director of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities for a term ending January 18, 1993 - Jesse McDonald of Springfield.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

To be the Inspector General within the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities for a term ending June 15th, 1994 - Cathleen Dombrowski of Springfield.

To be members of the Illinois Commerce Commission for terms ending January 15th, 1996 - Karl McDermott of Homer, and David Williams, Jr. of Chicago.

To be a member of the Illinois Human Rights Commission for a term ending January 18, 1993 - Sylvia Neil of Glencoe.

To be a member of the Illinois Human Rights Commission for a term ending January 16th, 1995 \div G.A. Finch of Chicago.

To be Chairman of the Illinois Liquor Control Commission for a term ending February 1, 1998 - Albert McCoy of Aurora.

To be members of the Pollution Control Board for terms ending July 1, 1994 - G. Tanner Girard of Grafton, and Theodore Meyer of Chicago.

To be the Executive Director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority for an unspecified term - Dennis Nowicki of Joliet.

Now, Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave to take those salaried appointments on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. If there is no further discussion, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, thank you. Now, with respect to the Governor's Message of April 1, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Capital Development Board for a term ending January 16, 1995 - Marcial Torres of Chicago.

To be members of the Capital Development Board for terms ending January 15th, 1996 - J. Paul Beitler of Winnetka, and Robert Oxtoby of Springfield.

To be a member of the Illinois Coal Development Authority for a term ending July 1, 1993 - Linda Sue Denton of Tamaroa.

To be members of the Illinois Coal Development Board for terms ending July 1, 1995 - Richard Brooks of Carbondale, and Porter Womeldorff of Decatur.

To be a member of the Illinois Gaming Board for a term ending July 1, 1992 - Robert Vickrey of Peru.

And also to be a member of the Illinois Gaming Board for a term ending July 1, 1994 - Michael Zaransky of Glenview.

To be a member of the Illinois Housing Development Authority for a term ending January 11th, 1993 - John Washburn of Wheaton.

To be a member of the Illinois State Medical Disciplinary Board for a term ending July 11, 1995 - Robert Hambrick of Burr Ridge.

To be a member of the Illinois State Police Merit Board for a term ending March 16th, 1998 - Nancy Beasley of Sycamore.

To be members of the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority for terms ending June 30, 1994 - Thomas Fitzgibbon of Des Plaines, and Alexander Lerner of Glencoe.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

To be members of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission for terms ending June 30, 1997 - Allen Baker of Pinckneyville, Robert Barr of Evanston, and Kay Tokunaga of Skokie.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

PRESIDENT BOCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave to consider these unsalaried appointments on one roll call. Without objection, is granted. If there's no further discussion, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that wish? question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I know we would have had 59 votes if we had our colleague, Senator Etheredge, who, because of the death of his mother, could not be with us. I now move that the Senate arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Kelly. Any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate does now arise from Executive Session. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can ask everybody to take their seats. This should be painless enough. We'll try to get a picture taken. I would ask those to turn to your left and right and make sure

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

everybody's in their proper place here. All right. The photographer requests that if you have -- he'd like to clear the desks, particularly in the first few rows so that there's little or no clutter.

(AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. It is approximately five minutes to one. We will work until approximately 5:30. We will be on the -- final passage stage virtually all day. So I would ask the Members to please be attentive. We're going to begin, with leave of the Body, on page 36. Page 36. There's a Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 511, and then we will move back to page 10 and start on Senate Bills 3rd Reading and go right down the line. If I can have your attention, WAND-TV and WCIA-TV have requested permission to videotape, and Public Radio WSSU has requested permission to record. Without objection, leave is granted. All right. Page 36 on the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen. The top of page 36. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports is a Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 511, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 511.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

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

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Conference Committee on Senate Bill 511 is the telecommunication rewrite. I think we're all aware of what it does. We've had a lot of discussions on this issue. We have had a lot of press, though it has went both ways on this issue. We have went through, in my estimation, what became an agreed bill process on this bill, and I think it has worked very well, taking care of the needs of all of the groups that are concerned with telecommunications. Keep in mind that this is enabling legislation only. Nowhere does this bill force the Commerce Commission to do anything. strictly allows the Commerce Commission to consider alternative regulation. And I -- I do want to take this time to take a little exception to some of the comments that have been made about the closed-mindedness of this issue, because I take strong exception to that. This bill has been debated, has been discussed; it has been massaged, and there has been many, many compromises made on Senate Bill 511. There are those who say that the consumer has been left out of the process. Well I'm here to ask you, and Gentlemen, who represents the consumers? You and I represent the consumers. It is not the Citizens Utility Board; it the Illinois Political Action Council. It is you and I, as legislators; we represent the consumer, so the consumer involved in this process day in and day out. And by golly, we feel that we've done a pretty good job. I'm not going to get into a lot of the issues, because I think we know what they're at. I think I do want to just clear up the fact that we are now have satisfied the needs of the Press Association and the Chicago Tribune. We have satisfied the needs of cable television. And in estimation, with the guarantee to -- for protection residential taxpayers that would require basic rates either to reduced or frozen for at -- at least three years - that's a tremendous protection to the consumer. We are one of only two states to have mandated that into law. It's a scary tactic we

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

take, as the Chicago Tribune mentioned, but we felt it was necessary in order to do our job - not the job of other outside groups, but our job of protecting the consumer. And I think we've done that well, and I'll try to answer any questions if I can.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 511. Discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

The -- the Citizens Utility Board, for which I have the highest respect, has made some comments to me, and -- and I'd like to know if this is true. Tell me, Senator Jacobs, under this Conference Report, will the rates - the telephone rates - be frozen at their present -- at present amount that they are, or reduced, or is there any possibility that they will be raised within the next three years?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, let me -- answer that this way. We have the commitment of Illinois Bell that they will not file for a rate increase prior to the enactment of this Act. I think -- I'll take them at their word on that, because let me tell you why. We'll still be in Session, and if they would pull something like that, I would be the first one to bring them right back into this Chambers, and we would change the law at that time.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Are you saying "prior to the enactment"? When will this Act be enacted, then, if it is voted by both Houses?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

If we pass both the Senate and the House, the Governor expects to sign this Thursday evening or Friday, as I understand it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'm asking these questions because I have to be satisfied in my own mind, if I vote for this bill, that I'm not going against the taxpayers or my district. The next question: The Citizens Utility Board said that one Illinois phone company has already proposed automatic rate hikes every year, tied to the rate of inflation. Is there any -- is that possible to be done under this Conference Report?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Under this Conference Committee Report, if they file under this Act, no, that is not allowable.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Do you have a commitment from the Illinois Commerce Commission that they will not raise the telephone rates for three years?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

That -- that will be the law, and it will be basic rates. And

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

it will be more than three years, because it's three years after the approval of a plan that would -- would be adopted, and it takes at least eleven months to do that. So the freeze would be good for a minimum of four years, if not more.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

One more question, please. This -- will this bill -- I believe this bill was jointly signed by both Democrats and Republicans, and I believe Majority Leader Jim McPike was on it. Is that right? Democrat. Now Republicans have signed it - both? And the thing that I'm concerned about -- I've had little cards from people who believe in the Citizens' Utility Board, and I do believe in them too, but I just want to know if they're mistaken here. I got a -- latest communique to -- this morning of a letter dated February 20, 1992, from the Coalition of Labor being against it, but I believe that was before the changes were made. Is that correct? In this bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

That is correct. In fact, the Illinois AFL-CIO, amongst all -- most of the business groups, and the Illinois Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Communication Workers of America, Chicago Teachers' Association are all in favor of this.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

One more question, please. Do you have a commitment from Illinois Bell - and of course AT&T is involved too, is it not? - and the Commerce Commission - that the service is going to be improved by the passage of this Conference Report and not raise

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

rates, as a whole, on our consumers for local services? PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I think to be all-inclusive, Senator, I think we just have to stick with our original statement that it is basic rates, and that's what we should be concerned about -- is what the -- the average individual - the poor person - buys is the basic rate structure, and that basic rate structure cannot be increased. And incidentally, AT&T is not part of this particular bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? That's the fifth last question. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

From your statement, then - have to get my thoughts together here - that the -- there's been inferences that there is a loophole in this Conference Committee Report that will prevent the rates from staying down. Do you -- do you have -- I have your commitment, I know, Senator Jacobs - if there is any inference like that, this will not take place; the rates will stay down in accordance with this Conference Report. Is that right? PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Correct. They will not go up. If they go anywhere, they will stay the same — the basic rate will either stay the same or it will go down. And of course, that'd be a great thing, because we haven't had that happen over the last five years. So it'd be nice to at least freeze them for at least four.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies -- Senate. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question, if I may?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Jacobs, I know over the past month or so there's been a lot of bickering back and forth with a lot of people that are included with this bill, and it's my understanding here that all the people, with the exception of CUB, are on board. I know the cable people were off, but I know they've been satisfied on everything. And CUB -- and I really haven't decided how I'm going to vote on this yet - but CUB stated that they were concerned that the money or additional revenue that could be raised by this, and improving the infrastructure, or whatever, or cable within the State of Illinois, that there's a possibility that this money could be used outside the State of Illinois. And they were just concerned that if this money were to be used in the State of Illinois, why wasn't it put in the bill specifically.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, as far as some of the profits that would be considered, as I understand it, Illinois Bell is a part of Ameritech. And so the fact of whether or not some of that could go out of this State or not, I am not really sure of that, Senator. I have to be perfectly honest; I have no idea. But as far as the -- the cross-subsidization and of the basic rates paying for anything else, there is prohibition in this law against that.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I guess that's what one of the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

objections was, Senator Jacobs; that although verbally a commitment was made that the money would be or remain -- within Illinois, at least on the surface there is that possibility because Ameritech is involved - I guess that's the parent company - that that money can be used elsewhere, other than Illinois. And that was one of CUB's objections. And I would just like to thank the sponsor for clarifying it for me. Thank you, Mr. President. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

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

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Senator, you mentioned that basic rates would not change and that most folks -- you purchase the basic rates. Do you know what they are, and could you give us a little explanation of that point?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

No, I don't know what the basic rate is. My wife can tell you, but I can't. But my only concern was, there was a -- a comment brought to us, and it was one of the concerns that CUB raised, that the -- the consumer was not being taken care of. So in this bill, we wanted to ensure that nothing would happen to the consumer's - the basic ratepayer's - phone bill; that it would not go up. We wanted that guarantee. We got a little bit better than that guarantee, and we have the guarantee that that remains the same. If it's -- if it's \$9.75 a month plus a nickel a call, it will stay at that, or it will be reduced.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

I think one concern is that of the others that have asked you questions, and that is of the small consumer - the senior citizens and the persons low on the totem pole - and would we be doing something that alter their rates. And you have said that you would be the first one in here to -- to see that that was not done. I -- I just -- can you give me some kind of idea how we can guarantee that, or function in on that?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Most certainly; it's in the bill. The bill says that you can't raise the basic rates. The only way that the basic rates can go is either to stay the same or go down, and that's in the bill. We're one of only two states to mandate that by law. It's mandated by law. So the Commerce Commission, nor Illinois Bell, nor anyone else can supersede that action.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

I, too, have met with CUB, as some of the others, and they have pointed out that there's a kind of loophole in that they would rush in and rate -- change the rate prior to the bill going into effect, and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And I think I heard your comment that this could not or would not happen. And I think that that is a farfetched-type situation. And so with that, I'll thank you.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Thank you. Some questions of the sponsor, Mr. President. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I've been trying to read the Conference Committee Report since the discussion started. Can you direct me to where in the Report we find the freeze language?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Page 22, Section (c), line 29.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Just in general, Senator: I understand that the statement is that there will be a freeze in basic rates for three years. Certainly, if there was a mass filing soon by the phone companies, that would break faith of everything that's happened here, and we, I think, would certainly quickly correct that. My concern is: When does the three-year -- when does the time clock on the three years begin - with the passage of this bill, or with the filing by a utility company for the alternative rating system? When does the clock begin to run?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It runs -- in my estimation, it runs simultaneously. It runs from the time the bill is signed, but the three years takes effect after the filing and after the approval. That's why I say that even though it's a three-year freeze, in my mind it's effectively a four-year or better freeze. During that period of time, they -- they cannot raise those rates.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Okay. So utility company B decides two years from now that they want to make a filing for an alternative rating system - are you saying that the rates are frozen during this two-year interval, in addition to a further three-year rate freeze? Or is that not what you said?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, if they do not file - that's why I say this whole thing is permissive - if they do not file for a rate -- for the -- the alternative rate, then they -- they remain under the current system. So nothing changes there. When they apply for the alternate rate is whenever the time limits takes over for the eleven-month review and then three years thereafter.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

So I -- I think it's important to all of us that we understand this. As I understand what you just said, until the utility files for the alternative plan, we're going to operate under our current system, which would allow them to request rate increases. But once they file for an alternative plan, then they are barred for three years. Now just tell me if that's right or wrong.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah, I think that's correct. But let me point out - we have a commitment from Illinois Bell that they will not file for -- they will file for alternative regulation, but they will not file

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

any other rate increases before they file for alternative regulation. I believe that. I take them at their word. If they do make the changes, then we'll come back and we'll take them to task on that. And as they say in the old country, Senator, "Paybacks are hell."

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of the Conference Committee Report on 511. There have been weeks and and weeks of negotiation, and there are some very important questions, indeed, that must be answered and I -- that have answered this morning, and probably more from other Senators who will want to ask questions of the sponsor. But those of us who have worked and really agonized over this particular legislation know that, for instance, the Citizens Utility -- CUB was opposed to the rewrite in 1985. They are opposed now. And my own -while I will not be here in 1999 when this negotiation sunsets, will predict that they will again be opposed. Now there are -certainly there are people -- this is not a perfect piece of legislation by any means, but it is extremely necessary for Illinois to go forward with technology to be competitive in 21st century. If we do not pass this bill today, it will really be an albatross around Illinois' neck. I think we should move forward. This is a good bill. Now it is a negotiation that has been accomplished through many hours of discussion and compromise, and I think that it is time for us to realize the need for this particular alternative regulation in Illinois. Thirty-three other already have this alternative regulation, and I would urge your support of this Conference Committee Report.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR PALMER:

President, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator, is it not true that under the current legislation there is already included a deregulation for telecommunication services which are demonstrated to be competitive?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

If there is, I am not aware of that. That is the reason for this bill, Senator, is so that those competitive items can be removed and they can operate under a free enterprise system.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

It was my understanding that that is, in fact, already in the current Act, and if so, I would wonder why we would need to have this Act, which, in my way of thinking, puts in some jeopardy the relationship between the cost of providing services and the profits that are going to be made as a result.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator Jacobs, I was talking here with one of the conferees, and she indicated that her understanding was that we would have -- we would have an opportunity to revisit this law in 1995.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It's '99, but -- you know, it's like everything else - we can -- we can revisit this any time we desire.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

So -- so it is 1999, rather than 1995.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

That is the repeal date, yes.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to ask Senator Jacobs - the gentleman that's on the Floor with us, can you tell me -- I don't know. He doesn't seem to be on the staff. Is he or is he not? And if so, have you received leave from the Senate to allow that? Is he -- what's his capacity?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

He is under contract and has been the -- the individual who has marshaled this bill through. He is not under -- he is not under Illinois Bell or any of the telecommunication systems' auspice.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Is he under a contract with the -- with the Senate, or is he

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

under a contract with -- with the utilities? I mean, who is he under contract with?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

He is under contract with the House, and I have asked him to step in over here to assist with the knowledge, because he's been at it from one day.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay. To the question of this infrastructure that's going to be taking place: What kind of a cost factor are we talking about in dollars? Do we know what it is going to be totaling out to?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, it's -- it's somewhere in the area -- the information we have received, that it will be in the area of three billion dollars over the next three years.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

And five -- you just advised me that it's five billion dollar. What -- three what? Okay. Three billion over a five-year period of time. Okay. Well, who's paying for this? In fact, if there's going to be a three-year moratorium, who is going to be covering the cost? The company? And then later on -- I mean, is this just something we're facilitating, or are we, in fact, after the three years, going to be looking to have the consumers carry this burden?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Now there is safeguards in the bill against cross-subsidization. And in the bill it states that the -- the consumer - the basic ratepayer - cannot subsidize other activities throughout the company of Illinois Bell, Ameritech -- I mean, Contel, Centel, any of them. This is not an Illinois Bell bill, incidentally. This is a telecommunications bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. One part of this new Conference Committee Report - which I might say I applaud its sponsor, Senator Jacobs, for, I think, making progress - still, I believe, is somewhat misleading. And I think Senator Schuneman raised it in his points, and I would like to add some additional points. while the sponsor has said that the utility has indicated that they would not put forward any rate increases prior to the enactment, let us remember that the enactment is only a few days away, and nothing moves that quickly in government anyhow. they put forward a freeze -- I mean, a rate hike increase at some point prior to having an alternative rate plan, they can -Senator Schuneman raised - they can, in fact, have that rate increase frozen for the next three years. And what the freeze means actually is that it's going to freeze access charges and calls within eight miles. Not much of a freeze for downstate For ninety percent of the Centel customers in the Chicago area of Des Plaines and Park Ridge and other there's no freeze at all. There's no freeze on touch-tone charges, on directory assistance, on installation, maintenance plans, et cetera. It doesn't really sound like much of a freeze to me. And for small business persons - the commercial

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

customers - who depend upon the phone for their business, in particular the real estate workers and others, there's no freeze. So to say that this freezes rates for three years, I think, is a little bit of a message of miscommunication to the consumers who are going to be stuck with this rate hike. I think when Illinois Bell and Ameritech and the Illinois Press Association got together, they came out with a package where they -- they advanced, they made progress, they won. But I think for the customers of this State - the consumers, the seniors on fixed incomes - I think they're going to find, if this passes, they lost. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Question please, Mr. Senator -- Mr. President.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman indicates he will yield, Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

The legislative intent of the amendment to Section 13-507 that common facilities and expenses shall he allocated to noncompetitive services as a group and to competitive services as a group, and shall not be allocated to individual services. Aggregate revenues for competitive services as a group must be equal to or greater than the aggregate competitive service costs, including the combination of imputed tariffed rates on a prospective basis for all individual services where required by new Section 13-501 -- 505 -- let me restate that -- Section 13-505.1, all other individual services' incremental costs, and all common facilities and expenses allocated to competitive services as a group. However, that portion of competitive services which is accounted for by imputation of noncompetitive tariffed rates shall be excluded from the basis for deriving the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

allocation of common facilities and expenses to competitive services as a group. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, for legislative intent, that is correct.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Maitland. Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. the co-sponsor of the Conference Committee Report on Senate As Bill 511, I rise in strong support. Let me take you back a years ago to the rewrite of the Public Utilities Act in 1985. Ι happened to have served on that -- that task force, and that was a long and tedious task. And some of the Members on this Floor some of the staff on this Floor were involved in that rewrite as At that time we were just coming off - perhaps a year, year and a half - from the breakup of AT&T, and it was the decision of the task force that it would be necessary or prudent to sunset the Telecommunications Act in four years because of the uncertainty about what that breakup was going to do. There were things technical in nature that were coming down the pike in the telecommunication industry that we just didn't know too much about. And we decided to sunset that and give us time to catch up with where we are today. This task of this rewrite has been going on now for nearly two years - a tremendous amount of work by a lot people, for long hours, from the private sector to the Legislature to the staff, to deal with this issue. And we finally reached an accord. The present method of rate of regulation is outmoded and outdated. It simply deals with the cost of providing the service versus a certain rate of return, and we've gotten wrapped up in bureaucratic rhetoric and delay and all

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

kinds of problems. And as a consequence, it has put a damper - or least a possible damper - on the way in which telecommunication is to be moved forward to provide the -citizens of this State and the business community of this State the kind of service we're going to need as we go into the next century. Each and every one of you in this Chamber have received a list of the organizations and the groups and the individuals who are supporting this effort. This is truly government at work. And the citizens have been involved. Everybody's been involved. The art of good government is -- is compromise and working through some difficult times, and that's what we've done. The unfortunate part about we do -- about what we do here today is that each and every one of us have to go back now to many of our senior citizens and others who have received inaccurate information inaccurate information - from some groups across this State, and that's unfortunate. We sat in committee and listened to testimony on -numbers that were supposed to be facts that weren't facts, and innuendos. And those people that all of us serve out there have this information and they're coming to us and begging us to vote against this bill. This very legislation - and talk to some of small rural companies that are involved as well - this legislation will benefit tremendously, in the decades ahead, senior citizens that we serve. Indeed we've got a rough road to hoe there, but the important thing today is this legislation this legislation that has citizen involvement, involvement, legislative involvement - must pass to allow the telecommunication industry to move into the next century. I strongly support Senate Bill 511.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Senator Jacobs, just to follow up on what Senator Schuneman

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

and Senator Savickas said - those of us who are happy about the three-year moratorium on rate increases. I, too, would like to ask a question about that, and that is, are we talking about all the rates? If I make a call to a 708 area code and I live in Chicago or even a Chicago area that's beyond five or ten miles, are all of those rates going to be frozen? Is it just the access charge, which is the smallest charge? What, indeed, are we really freezing here? Because the language is not clear. And if I'm going to justify a vote or talk about a vote, I want to know exactly what we're freezing. I hear we're freezing all rates. Now are we, or are we not?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, no. We have indicated from day one we are not freezing all rates. We are freezing basic rates, and basic rates in that area are included in local calling areas. If you call outside of a local calling area, just as if you would use AT&T or anyone else, those things remain the same, unless they request for an alternative type of regulation. But under this bill, the basic rate - the very basic rate you pay for - is covered under the -the freeze. As far as anything outside of the eight-mile area in Chicago there are some, I understand, you know, because of the size - you get outside of the eight-mile radius, that may or may not be covered. That -- that I can't answer. I know in my area ninety-five percent of the calls are eight-mile area. So that part I can't say. All I can tell you is that the basic rate is the part that will be frozen and/or reduced, which is the basic line rate.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

The -- the only concern that I have is that if you take a look at your phone bill - and sometimes we do and sometimes we don't - but if you take a look at your phone bill, probably the smallest part of your phone bill is the basic rate. The place that you really get hit is on those charges beyond five miles or ten miles. And is this -- if we pass this bill, are we, in fact, passing on a rate increase - or forget the word "rate" - an increase to our constituents? Is the passage of 511 going to mean an increase in phone bills, which is all our people care about - they don't want to -- they don't care about the words "rate," "access", whatever - is the bill to my constituent going to be higher, as a -- within the next three years, as a result of this -- passage of this bill? PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, I can't look into the crystal ball and tell you exactly that, no more than I can look into a crystal ball and tell you under the current plan would it be any higher. All I can tell you is for those — that portion of the bill which is covered under the rate freeze will not go up. Now as far as — as dialing outside of the area, that's a competitive issue in most cases, because you can use any telephone company you want — so they bid for that. So, you know, I can't guarantee you that it will go up or it'll go down from that standpoint. All I can guarantee you is that the basic phone rate user, which is the majority of the people in this — this State, their rate will either be frozen and/or will go down.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Many of us have worked on this bill for a year and a half to two years, and we have had a lot of

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

hearings - public, private, in between, in our offices. And I've been opposed to this bill for most of the last two years, but I've decided to support it here at the end, because I think it's the best arrangement that can be worked out among the parties. I was for a profit-sharing proposal that was brought up to me by the president of Illinois Bell. It was rejected by the Citizens Utility Board. It would have eliminated the idea of a windfall profit, because any -- any profits would have been split between customers and the company. So there was an out, but there was reluctance to negotiate on the part of the Citizens Utility Board and some of the other groups. I thought that was an compromise. Unfortunately, the parties who opposed this were not in a mood to compromise. The reason I changed my opinion on this bill is the last hearing we had - last week - we had testimony concerning the very first page of the bill, where you policy statement. If you turn to letter (f), the addition to this bill that was not in the bill that CUB is pushing in the House and the bill they are pushing and they're recommending is House Bill 4043 - the difference is, in this Conference Committee Report there is a recommendation that it be the policy of the State of Illinois that "development of and prudent investment in advanced telecommunications networks that foster economic development of the State should be encouraged." I asked CUB why they didn't that in their bill. They said they -- they didn't think they needed it. But when we asked the witnesses, the witnesses testified otherwise. One witness, by David Baker, who's the -who is a member of the Illinois Coalition, said that the testimony that he provided was in support of the proposed rewrite because it promoted new technologies which will include fiber-optic cables, digital switches, satellite cable, digital cellular-creating voice data and live video transmission, high-speed reception equipment, high-capacity work stations,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

miniaturized computers, cellular phones, fax and video receivers. further stated that there is a need for a market-driven process to sort out these new telecom technologies, current rate regulation provides little incentive to install these new technologies. And if you can imagine with any business, if you're not going to make a profit, there's not going to be much incentive to invest in -- in upgrading your business. Another witness we had was Paul Foran from the Illinois and I also asked him if he thought that provision was necessary or if it was just redundant, and repeated something that the Commerce Commission already had authority to do. He testified that they needed that provision so that they would have guidance and some way to guide themselves and the members to foster economic development by going and allowing telephone companies to invest in high tech equipment. That, for me, was very important. I think that the addition of the rate freeze adds a great deal to I'm not sure I understand the opposition to the rate freeze, because the basic opposition to this bill is that Illinois Bell wants alternative regulation so they can make more money, but yet, under the rate freeze provision, they're being accused of trying to rush in before the freeze goes into effect under the existing law, which doesn't allow them to make as much money alternative rate regulation, which they want; and therefore, they're going to subvert this bill. Well, if this bill is going to make more money for Illinois Bell, why wouldn't they wait till it's in effect? I don't understand the logic of that. Ι£ this bill is going to make more money for them, they would wait till it's in effect to go in for a rate increase. What -- what testimony before the committee was, was that it would take eleven months for a rate increase to go through - for an alternative rate plan to go through. In addition to the three years, that's nearly four years, as Senator Jacobs has said. The Commerce Commission

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

said they need three years to study any alternative regulation. When I asked them if they will propose modifications or just accept Illinois Bell's plans, they said they intend to study the plan and propose their own modifications. They also, I might candidly say, said they may want more money from us so they can hire more staff to study these alternative rate regulation proposals that may come up. In addition, some of the opponents to the bill -- the major opponent at the end turned out to be the Press Association. They appear to be taken care of a new Section, Section 13-508.1, by requiring a separate subsidiary requirement for electronic publishing, separating the phone company from its existing line of work and electronic publication. So I think that that separation added a great deal to the bill as well. Is this the best bill that could be fashioned? No. I think I had a much better bill, and I had that bill a year and a half ago. Is it the best bill that we can come forward at this time? I think, yes. I think that what Senator Marovitz said about our constituents has to be rebutted. He said our constituents only care about rates. I think they care more than that. I think they care about keeping jobs in Illinois, developing more jobs in Illinois, bringing Illinois into the 21st century, having advanced telecommunication networks and fostering economic development. I think our constituents are concerned about that as well. So nobody can quarantee rates won't go up. Nobody can guarantee they will go down. This bill guarantees that your basic service will stay the same for four -- for three years and eleven months. I think that's probably the best arrangement that we can come up with, and I intend to vote for it. PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, Central Picture has requested leave to film for an informational film on the General Assembly, apparently at the request of the Taxpayers' Federation.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Without objection, leave is granted. If there's no further discussion, Senator Jacobs may close.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, and we'll try to keep it brief. Т just think that this is a progressive pro-consumer legislation. And to my good friends, in particular on this side of the that question whether or not there will be a rate increase or whether it's a true rate increase - I challenge you to whenever the Citizen Utility Board and/or anyone else has ever gotten you or the consumer a rate reduction. Give me folks. This is progressive. This is looking out the front window. Everybody else wants to look out the rearview This is looking into the area of economic development for our My good seatmate, Senator Severns, says that it doesn't freeze a lot of the other things other than basic rate. correct. You know what else it doesn't freeze? It doesn't freeze the cost of automobiles going up; it doesn't freeze the cost their labor going up; it doesn't freeze a lot of the other things that enter into the cost of doing business. I'm a great in a free enterprise system. I just want to add one thing in closing: that the alternate regulation is simply a modification traditional public utility regulation which can only be implemented in Illinois if - and I think these are very big "ifs" - it is in the public interest, will produce just and reasonable rates, responds to actual industry changes, is a more appropriate regulation, ensures that ratepayers will benefit, will form of maintain service quality and availability, and will not unduly disadvantage any customer, class or carrier. I ask you to vote on behalf of the consumers of the State of Illinois and vote Aye.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 511. Those in favor will vote Aye.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 14 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 511, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. — Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, it's my pleasure to introduce to the Senate today the Millburn School, together with the principal, Gary Cybul, and instructor, Jim Norgard, and three of the parents — four of the parents; Sharon Davis, Cheryl Kucera, Susan Patti and Pat Padgett; and the students up in the President's Gallery. And we welcome you here today, and we're glad to see you all here.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guest please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Donahue, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I also rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

I have a group of students from the 48th Senate District. They are my student advisory council and they're in galleries behind me, and there are about fifty-seven plus. Many of their

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

parents are with them as well. I'd like them to be recognized.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Rea, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege. PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR REA:

I have here today the representation from the YMCA Youth in Government. In fact, we have the governor and his staff from the Sesser-Valier High School. And at this time, I would like to introduce the advisors: Penny Morgan and Gene Morgan; also the head page, Chip Basso; the press secretary, Greg Cockrum; the campaign manager, Adam Compton; and sitting right beside me is our youth governor of the State of Illinois from Sesser, Governor Gene Valente. And would the others please stand.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Governor, congratulations. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now, with leave of the Body, turn to page --page 10 on the Calendar. We'll start on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. As is indicated on the back of the Calendar, there are 199 bills on 3rd Reading. So I would ask you please to be attentive and be mercifully brief.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Page 10, Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 1485.

Senator Rock. Madam Secretary, read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1485.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 1485 is a conveyance from the Department of Central Management Services and the Department of Children and Family Services of approximately sixty-five and a half acres in Hanover Township in Cook County and a couple of pieces of a township in DuPage County. It represents that State facility that we've known over the years as Herrick House, and I'm sure you're aware that last July, or prior to July -- July 1st, Maryville, the City of Youth from Des Plaines, Illinois, was requested by the Department to assume the responsibility for that program. The program has expanded. It is the considered judgment of all concerned that additional facilities have to be built. The ones that are there are currently in some jeopardy, in terms of the Life Safety Code. And in order to make that capital -- capital expenditure and to expand the program, this conveyance is thought by everybody to be absolutely essential. It does contain, obviously, the full reversionary rights to the State of Illinois. In the event that Maryville and/or the State decide that this program is no useful or that it's not used for a child care, or Maryville decides it no longer wishes to utilize this land, immediately back to the State. I know of no objection. I have talked with the Township Officials, as have others in this I think it's fair to say that this now meets with the agreement of everybody, and I would solicit your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1485 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

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 1485, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1486. Senator Holmberg. 1496. Senator Topinka. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1496, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1496.

(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, basically through the amendment which we have worked out with the -- the CTA and the RTA, all opposition has been opposed -- or has been removed, and what we would now do is we would provide that RTA budget materials would be made available to the public for viewing at no cost at least three weeks prior to any public hearings. We've also asked that board members would be present at a majority of the hearings. We outlined the Whistle Blower Protection Act, which basically tracks what the State does now. We make sure that there's no disciplinary action taken against employees who would report law or rule violations, those mismanagement, abuse of authority, gross waste of funds and danger to public health and safety. And again, it is agreed to. It has been worked out, and I know of no opposition at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1486 <sic> (1496) pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1496, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1499. Senator Dunn. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1499, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1499.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Tom Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill would authorize the Secretary of State to suspend the driving privileges of an individual who was convicted of the aggravated -- offense of aggravated discharge of a firearm from a motor vehicle. This would allow the Secretary to suspend that license for up to a period of three years. It's an obvious answer to drive-by shootings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1499 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 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1499, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1508. Senator Rock. Senate Bill 1508, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1508.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 1508 as amended is an amendment -- is a Senate. proposal to amend the Fish and Aquatic Life Code. It concerns itself with commercial fishing licenses in Lake Michigan, and there are three essential changes that this proposal calls One, it increases the poundage or tonnage or yellow perch and bloater chubs that can legally be taken from the lake, and I will tell you that number is still under negotiation with the Director and others in the Department of Conservation. Secondly, it provides for the issuance of an additional two licenses. We currently have three. This would call for five and would, in addition, direct the Department to have the life of the license be five years, as opposed to an annual or a yearly license so that those boat owners and commercial fisherman can, indeed, accordingly and make the kind of capital expenditures that are necessary to keep their equipment and boats safe. As I indicated, there is a task force of both House and Senate working closely with the Department of Conservation, with the Commercial Fishing Association and are in constant contact with the sport fishermen. is still under negotiation. Ιt Senator Philip and I are cosponsoring this, and we will be involved in the continuing negotiations. I would ask your favorable consideration so that we can move this over to the House and keep the negotiations alive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I certainly concur with everything Senator Rock says. I certainly think we need more commercial license in Lake Michigan,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

particularly compared to the states that are neighbors. And also, the only question I have is the four hundred and fifty thousand pounds. As you know, we -- Lake Michigan has an overabundance of perch and overabundance of bloater chubs. Unfortunately, you can't sell -- nobody eats smoked chubs these days. They can sell the perch. And certainly we ought to try to work with the Department of Conservation to come up with a reasonable poundage. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Rock, this bill has to do with bloated chubs. As we cut down pinstripe patronage, have some of your friends been knocked off the payroll and you're simply attempting to -- to have us find a way to protect them so we don't string them in on the line or anything like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is that a question? Further discussion? Senator Schaffer. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

If the sponsor would. My instincts tell me that this is a bill that might generate considerable controversy between the commercial fishing industry and the many thousands of sports fishermen in Northern Illinois. I have not heard from any of these sports fishing organizations — the guys that go out and fish who have the little down-riggers and what have you. I'm a little nervous that the last time we tried this there was quite a hullabaloo among those people, and I'm not sure how you net one kind of fish without getting the kind of fish they're interested in. Have we — you know, when we say everybody's agreed to this,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

are we saying that -- we aren't saying everybody agreed to it. I

-- I just -- I'd like a little better reading and some assurances
that the sports fishing interests, which, in candor, probably are
much more vital to this State than the commercial fishing industry
in terms of tourism and number of dollars generated - not to
mention the number of Illinois citizens actively involved - I hope
that we have some assurances that they are being consulted and
that their wishes and what's good for sports fishing will also be
very -- an important part of the mix on whatever the final version
of this bill is. Assure me, I guess is what my question is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. Yes, Senator Schaffer, I can tell you that representatives of the Sport Fishing Association are, indeed, involved as members of the ad hoc committee or task force that was primarily set up by Representative Matijevich, has a number of those boat owners and sport fishermen within the confines of his district. I'm not going to -- I will assure you that they will continue to be part of the -- the overall discussion. I'm not sure we're ever going to make them totally happy. There have been two or three recent surveys; one by the Department - one by the commercial fishermen, and one by an independent group - which indicate that the incidental catch that concerns the sport fishermen is simply not as great as everybody once thought it was. And I think they are involved in that We would hope to try to accommodate them as best we can. But my judgment is that this is beneficial to the lake fish population because, as Senator Philip indicated - and knows much better than I - it is -- it is pretty well agreed that there is an overpopulation of perch, simply enough are not being taken out. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this legislation. We had this in the Agriculture and Conservation Committee. And you know, the State of Indiana has about a hundred thousand acres of -- of lake rights in Lake Michigan, and they're allowed to take about as many of these fish as the State of Illinois is, with about four hundred and fifty thousand acres. The thing about this is that if they don't allow them to take some of these, they're going to be overstocked, there won't be enough vegetation, enough forage for the -- for the game fish, and I think this is probably a good piece of legislation. I would ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Rock may close.

SENATOR ROCK:

I would ask for a favorable roll call, with the assurance that Senator Schaffer requested - that those other interests will certainly be represented in the negotiations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1508 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1508, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1509. Senator Geo-Karis. Madam Secretary, 1509, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1509.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is -- this bill might be commonly known as the Learnfare Bill, and what this bill does is provides that children who are on public aged thirteen to nineteen, who are parents, must either attend school or be trained for a vocation. And I think this -it's necessary, because if we don't train people for a better job, I don't know how they're going to get in a better work force. I urge for a favorable vote. It provides for three pilot programs and -- this one pilot program will be in Chicago, one in an urban area of at least fifty thousand persons, and one pilot in a rural And this bill also sunsets the Learnfare Program after two school years, and sets up reporting times for the Department of Public Aid to inform the General Assembly on the program's progress. And it's supported by the Department of Public Aid, and the costs are minimal - I think it's under ten thousand dollars and the amendment provides that the Department of Public Aid would not be required to operate the program if the necessary federal waiver cannot be obtained. Now Wisconsin has adopted a similar program, but had a lot of bugs in it. We've tried to take the bugs out of our bill, and I urge favorable consideration. Ιf don't train our young people for a better job, how are they going to meet the work force?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. A question to the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR SMITH:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Thank you. Senator Geo-Karis, I'd like to inquire of you, since Senate Bill 1509 - and we spoke about this in committee - is somewhat modeled after the Wisconsin Learnfare Program, can you tell us what has been happen in the Wisconsin experience?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

They've had some problems - administrative problems. They've been working them out, and it seems that it's working to keep the kids in school, and we're trying to do our best here too.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

I'd like to say, can you provide us with any evidence at all that the bill such as yours, and that of 1540, which is Senator Watson's bill which ties the receipt of public assistance to the modification of the recipient behavior - will that work?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Are you talking about Senator Watson's bill about the number of children? This has nothing to do with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

One more question. I'd like to ask, does 1509 require the federal waiver from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

If we don't get a federal waiver, they cannot do it. Yes,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

ma'am.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

One more thing and I'm through. Is there a fiscal impact?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Yes. We filed a fiscal impact note, which is very minimal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Although I certainly applaud all efforts to help children stay in school, I rise in opposition to this bill. It has been my professional experience, working with children at risk who are the children of welfare recipients, that there is no evidential correlation between holding their checks and their children going into and staying in school. I would prefer, if we are going to make an effort to promote school attendance, that we do it in another way that is nonpunitive to families. I think that it is already very difficult to be a single parent, head of household, to be a woman who is in charge of many children and to be threatened with the possibility of losing that small amount of money because children are not in school. I think there are other ways to do this, and I would urge that we rethink.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I speak in behalf of this bill, because I think one thing that we

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

have consistently heard in terms of our debates on cutbacks, in terms of public aid cutbacks, in terms of social services, is the fact that, you know, we have to provide some opportunity. And if there's going to be some cutbacks involved, then we need to provide avenues that people indeed can help themselves to get off of -- off of social service programs, which now eat up a great deal of the State budget. This indeed gets kids into school. I think if we're going to make any impact on this cycle that keeps people in -- in welfare, that it has to start somewhere with education, and indeed this can provide an incentive, because I know surely if I had a check dependent on this, I might start feeling a bit more maternal or paternal or -- or, you know, parental in getting my kid to school. It certainly gives a family some reason over and above just the natural reason for wanting to keep a child in school. I think it's a very, very good plan. We have to make some move somewhere or just agree to throw up our hands and say, "This is it, and we're going to accept life as it is." And I would hate to think we've come to that point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Is it not the law of the State of Illinois that you must remain in school until you're sixteen years of age?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Yes.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Then why do we need this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Because this bill is tied up with their -- the funds they'll get. And if they're not going to be conscientious and go to school, what are we going to do? Just sit back and let them not learn?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

To the bill: It seems as though that we're cluttering our books with unnecessary laws and rules and regulations. We seem to want to penalize people that already are on the low end of the totem pole. We want to cut funding to them. We want to not only cut funding to them, but through cutting funding to them, we will hurt other members of their families and other innocent people. And I just don't feel that this is a good way to go, once that we already have a law on the books. And what the sponsor is saying is that they don't obey that law that is on the books. Then why would we think that they would obey this law that we're going to put on the books? And that is the purpose and the reasoning of my position.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank -- thank you very much. I serve on the -- on the Infant Mortality Commission. Senator Brookins, you might be interested in knowing - the average age of an unwed mother in our State now is

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

fourteen. That means she's getting pregnant in eighth grade. These girls are indeed dropping out of school with absolutely no chance for a future whatsoever. We certainly should pass this bill, as — as the first step towards correcting that situation. In the first place, some of these girls, if they know they're going to have to come back to school irregardless, might think twice before they go ahead and — and get pregnant. Second of all, the second thing we ought to be doing is setting up some kind of care for these — the products of these pregnancies within the schools or within the school range, so that these girls can go back to school. I think this is a good bill. I think we ought to support it and we ought to try and get these girls back in school, because if we don't, statistically, eighty—two percent of them will have another child by the time they're seventeen years old.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hall.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

SENATOR HALL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR HALL:

Senator Geo-Karis, would you mind telling me what's the real reason you want this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Senator Hall, I will tell you the real reason, and I'll base it on what a young woman of minority wrote to me after she got off of welfare. She said, "Thank you so much for trying to get us to keep our jobs - to get a job - because I have been on welfare a year and a half. I finally got a job and I'm learning. I am going to school nights, and I feel like a respected citizen, and I have my self-respect back." I'm trying to help young people to learn. And if you can't see it, I'm -- I'm really surprised, because these youngsters who go and get themselves pregnant whether they like it or not -- I'm -- I'm not telling them what to do with their lives, except that I think they should be trained, so they can have a better chance for a better life. Do you want to keep them in the welfare mentality, or do you want to put them on the workfare? I want to put them on the workfare.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Well, Senator, I am surprised; as long as I have been around here with you, I'm surprised that you would even attach your thinking to that. The real reason behind all of this is that the — it's just sad today that we have a society — if you ever look in a book that anything to Children and Family Service, what do you see on the front page? You see a minority mother with a lot of children. The real reason is that it's not the Children and Family Service that's eaten up all this money; it's the — what happens is the medicals. People that — in nursing homes. People that are in all these age of thing. But do you realize that there's so many more people who are not minorities in this country today? Because every time you look, for every minority you see on public aid, there are three others that are not on — that are on

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

public aid. The real reason is when you come and say that interested in trying to stick these kids - and I think that your cohort over there has a bill similar to that - that if you -- if you have three children and you get another, that that child should not eat, or should not have a worth. The point is, when you think in this -- today we have what we call -- the high class name is "subsidy." We subsidize farmers. We have a train runs from Chicago to St. Louis, called the State House. Subsidized. What we need to do is to face the facts. You've got to take care of the poor, the sick and the elderly. And all of us can't be in that same shape. It's -- I'm surprised that you would even attempt to put this out, Senator. I know you very well, and I don't think it's your real intention of what you're saying that This is a terrible bill, and it should be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Frankly, I think the debate on this bill is symptomatic of some of the basic problems in our country. If you take a look this bill, it is a very reasonable proposal. There are a number of exemptions for why -- in cases where a recipient would not be impacted by this bill, including any reason that the Department of Public Aid choose -- chose to approve. For instance, recipient needed to have their teenage daughter home to babysit for younger kids because the other parent was in the hospital or sick, Department of Public Aid would give them an exemption. If -the Department of Public Aid is anything, it's reasonable on that sort of stuff. The bottom line is, in this society how you have a chance without an education? I have a college classmate of mine that runs a truancy program in my district, asked her to kind of explain the truancy problem in my part of the world. And I admit my part of the world's not the same as the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

rest of the world, but I think there are a lot of similarities. She said the number one problem they had was parents wanting their daughters home to babysit. She told me about an honor student who was denied an education by her parents, so they could go out drinking while she babysat. That's what this bill is all about. And I don't see how anybody who gives a darn about the next generation can be against this bill. How do you have a chance without an education? Kids should not be denied an education so their parents can go out drinking, and that's what this bill's all about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Severns. Senator Severns. SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise with some concerns for colleague and friend Senator Geo-Karis' bill. And it's a bill at least when I first heard the idea - I entertained introducing In fact, rather than pilot projects, I would have introduced the bill probably to take care of the entire State. was for the concept, because along with Senator Schaffer and Senator Kelly and Brookins and others, we worked a long time to keep kids in school and to keep those dropout rates down, rather than climbing. My concern with the bill is evidence that has been provided by the Wisconsin examples simply doesn't show that it's worked - in fact, to the contrary. studies that have been produced as a result of the experiment in Wisconsin shows that it's had no impact on keeping kids in school. But what it does impact are the families with young children, three- and four- and five-year-olds who suffer because that sixteen- or seventeen-year-old has chosen not to go to school. that we need to do all that we can do to put increased responsibility on the family to keep those kids in school. we would try a dropout bill that has worked in West Virginia,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

that's shown -- that has shown a thirty-three-percent increase of students returning to the classroom. I wish we would try some bills that have worked elsewhere. Unfortunately, to my chagrin, this bill hasn't worked. This idea hasn't worked in Wisconsin. And for that reason, I changed my mind and decided not to introduce it. I don't think it's going to work in Illinois either, Senator Geo-Karis. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I, -- you know, I'm really perplexed about the people who have spoke against this legislation. Not necessarily the previous speaker, but some of you who -- who represent the more less fortunate people of this State. You ought to be for this. This -- this legislation is not I mean, all the research that we have -- that we have read on this says that education is the answer. I mean we have -since the mid-sixties and back further - we have thrown dollar after dollar, millions and billions of dollars at the welfare problem in this country. The so-called War on Poverty. have to -- have to admit - and I think most of you would have to admit - how successful have we been. How successful have we been at solving the problems of poverty? We have seen -- this was supposed to be a safety net, and now it's become a way of life, generation after generation of people stuck in a quagmire of poverty and welfare. And how do we get them out? We educate We give them the opportunity to help themselves. And those of you that have spoke against this, you know, what is answer? A bigger check? I don't think that's the answer. You're helping the people that you're representing. You can help them today by supporting legislation such as this. This gives those people the opportunity to educate themselves, to train

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

themselves, and make something of their life. That's what this is all about. This is not punitive. Once and for all, help those people that have sent you here to do the duty of your districts and the people that you represent and the people of this State. And to do that, the proper vote on this is Aye. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President. Well, I have a little different view, even though the sponsor, who I respect greatly and I don't know why I chose her bill to attack, because she is one of the more caring, certainly very personable and kind legislators I know in this General Assembly. But I think it's an attitude that's pervasive, not only in Springfield, but in Washington, where we are continually taking away money from the needy. continuing -- and to like let them make it on their own. Let swim for the shore. It's the wrong attitude, the wrong direction we ought to be taking. I think what we have to do is do more to provide opportunities for employment. We send these kids back to school where there's fifty-percent illiteracy, or there's dropout that are fifty percent and more. And this isn't going to guarantee that they're continue on, but it will guarantee that some good people will be losing badly needed funds, and God knows how much we've taken away from the poor already. And I think we ought to search our conscience and do the right thing and oppose this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Alexander.

SENATOR ALEXANDER:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to the substance of this bill - not the sponsor of the bill, who I hold in high esteem. Yes, we need to think about how to correct these

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

eons of poverty and welfare situations that exist. Yes, you have heard, as I have heard, that there are more persons of the other expression than Afro-Americans in the systems of the dole-out, whether it be by subsidies of higher nature that Senator Yes, we've heard of peer pressures. I know you know that we know that the peer pressures that our youth are faced with today are ones that are not the ones that we endured and went through when we came through as young persons. You know that as well as I do. So how do you expect a mother to keep her young adult or youth in school when peer pressure demands that they do things that are contrary to what you and I consider to be the norm of life? Yes, we have all contributed to this situation of welfare system or the dole system, from the government in Washington clean through to this very House in which I now serve. There has not been adequate providing for housing that the people can go in and live in. There has not been adequate providing for When you have four jobs out there in some portions of this city, you have thousands standing in line for jobs, yet you say education. You have not provided for proper funding of education, so what are we talking about? I'm not advocating the continuation of the welfare system. I'd like to see it completely destroyed, but in the meanwhile, what do you do about those who have a need to utilize this system in order to exist? We're not being fair. We came here to be legislators for the people of the State of Those who run corporations and those who Illinois. All people. are at the bottom of the totem pole, to try to bring them into the mainstream of what we consider the American way of life. Thank you. I'm opposed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, Madam President. There's been some talk here about

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

education and kids staying in school, and we might as well talk about motherhood and apple pie, because fifty-nine Members in this Body want kids to stay in school, and want everybody to get an education. We all know that. Let's not pontificate. Education is the answer, and we want kids to stay in school. Senator Watson asked, you know, what's our answer? What's your solution? And I don't -- I really think if anybody had it, they'd probably be President of the United States, 'cause God knows, the public wants a change. And money alone isn't the answer. No question. Pouring more money into a bad system is not the answer. Senator Geo-Karis, let me ask you this question: This is patterned after Wisconsin, I think, that has something like this, and has tried it. And so we as legislators - is -- is that correct - is this patterned after Wisconsin? Doesn't Wisconsin have this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

It is patterned, but they have changed. They had made some mistakes and they've taken some of their mistakes out and it is working. The latest results that we've heard is it's beginning to work, and we've got it -- we have a chance to try it here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I want to delve into this a little bit. When did Wisconsin first pass this -- first pass this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'm not sure, but it might have been '89 or '90.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Your bill calls for us to get a report every six months after the passage. So assuming that if this passed in '89, Wisconsin would have some empirical evidence about the effectiveness of the legislation. Tell me about the effectiveness of the Wisconsin legislation, that this is patterned after, that — that — that indicates that this is going to be an answer or an improvement. What has Wisconsin found?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Wisconsin has found that they had made some mistakes in the way they administered the bill. And you can't compare Wisconsin with Illinois. We've got to make some effort to try, for heaven's sakes, to help young people. And by young people, I don't mean just black or Latino; I meant white people, too, because I have a flock of them in my high school at home that are pregnant at thirteen and fourteen years of age and what have you. And all that we're trying to do is help young people get a grip on life so that they don't have to feel that they're going to stay on welfare. It that wrong?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Senator Geo-Karis, the principle of what you are trying to do is the same, whether you are talking about Illinois, Rhode Island, Wisconsin or California. Why can't we compare this principle and the effectiveness to Wisconsin? And what mistakes did Wisconsin make, and what -- what has the improvement rate been in attendance since the passage of that legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I might tell you that this is a pilot program, whereas in Wisconsin it was something for the whole State constantly. There's a big difference. That's why we're trying to do it as a pilot program here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Let me ask you this. If it was a statewide program in Wisconsin - and I'm not trying to be argumentative; I'm trying to get some -- a serious answer to a serious question - if it was a statewide program in Wisconsin, tell me how it worked statewide in Wisconsin. What were the results and what were the increase in attendance at schools and graduation rate and dropout rate in Wisconsin?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Don't -- I don't have the numbers, but I'm trying to tell you two things, and I somehow -- I don't seem to be getting clear to you. One, this a pilot program. Two, Wisconsin's on a statewide. We don't have the answers about how many are still in school, but we have heard that kids are being -- staying in school, rather. So all I can tell you, Senator Marovitz, it's worth trying this pilot program. This is not a -- it's not permanent. It sunsets in two years. Why not give it a chance, for heaven's sakes? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

This will be the last comment I'll make. I understand it's a pilot program, so I understand, and I understand that's a

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

statewide program. So we ought to have some evidence statewide what it did. Since that may be the most important question, why don't you take this bill out of the record for a couple days. Let's find out what the results were in Wisconsin. There are results, good or bad. Let's find out what those results were; you can come back tomorrow or next week after we get those results of that statewide program, and -- and you'll tell us whether you're going to convince us that it worked in Wisconsin statewide.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

First of all, I think it's worth trying here in Illinois. It's being tried in Wisconsin. The the bill is there, two or three years old. From what we hear, it has improved to keep kids in school. That much we know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Geo-Karis, where will the pilot programs operate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

One pilot program will be in Chicago. One pilot will be in an urban area of at least fifty thousand people, and one pilot program will be in a rural area.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

In Chicago in what areas?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

The Department will decide that - where it's the greatest need, I presume.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Geo-Karis, you're very much aware of the gang problem that we have, not only in the City of Chicago, but in other parts of the State. And I am sure you're aware of some of the recent studies that show that one of the leading causes of dropouts is the fear of gangs and gang activity. What do you say to a family in a neighborhood where that becomes the primary concern, where there is a fear for loss of life and individuals are not able to attend school, and the board of education is not facilitating the transfer of that individual, so the person is stuck? And I have several cases like that, that I'm dealing with right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I certainly, Senator del Valle, knowing how capable you are, I would be taking on that board of education and finding why they don't do it in a hurry. I think you have -- you're absolutely justified in what you are saying.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

We have thousands of cases like that. But -- but to the bill, Madam Chair: I -- I really appreciate what you are trying to do, Senator Geo-Karis, and I -- and I respect your -- your efforts and

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

in no way guestion your -- your intent here. think that we ought to be looking at issues like this one within the broader context of welfare reform, number one. Number two, we shouldn't be looking at these kinds of issues only during election vears. Number three, we ought to be looking at creating incentives, rather than creating penalties, because if we look at - and a lot of people don't understand that the income programs in the State have not grown. We're not talking about a lot of money. And maybe what we ought to be talking about increasing grant levels to individuals that are participating in these kinds of activities, rather than creating the kinds penalties that are going to hurt families where through no fault of their own, youngsters are not able to attend the school. analysis says that the person does not have a valid reason for not attending school -- if the person does not have a valid reason for not attending school, then this person will be not eligible. And that this will be determined by the Department of Public Aid. How is the Department of Public Aid going to take into account concern regarding the safety of children in certain neighborhoods? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

First of all, that is a police matter. And second of all, the Department of Public Aid is willing to stick its neck out and try and do something. This bill, by the way, very similar bill exactly like this — well, in fact, it was exactly like this, I understand — was passed last year when — which was not an election year, by forty—two votes from this Senate, and it was held up in the House. I mean, what we're trying to do is help youngsters to achieve responsibility. And how are you going to do that when you say, if they don't have a valid reason, they don't have to go to school, or even be retrained. Is that what you're

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

saying?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Madam President. According to our analysis, this bill is one of the National Republican Party's recommendations. I don't know if it's a welfare reform recommendation or an education recommendation. If it's a welfare reform bill, it would seem that it would need to be much more comprehensive. If it's an education bill to keep kids in school, it seems that it's operating on the wrong end of the age spectrum for those students who are As an educator, and a parent educator, I know from all the research, that a child's attitude towards learning is firm by the time they are three years of age. Their attitude about school, whether they're going to stay in school, whether they're going to love learning. We had a bill on the Floor of this Senate last year that was an early intervention bill. Something that states were doing all over the United States, which we passed, but before we passed it, the Republican side of the aisle put amendment on to gut all the funding. And Senator Schaffer, you and I were co-sponsors of that bill. If we're not going the things that research shows us will truly keep students in skill -- in school, why are we doing these small Band-Aid approaches that, although may be not terribly expensive, are still three hundred thousand dollars, and to the best of our knowledge let me pick up on what Senator Marovitz has said - Wisconsin -the Wisconsin plan is showing us that it does not work. It is too late to be helping students to stay in school, and I oppose the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Ladies and Gentlemen, Thank you. there's a great deal of discussion here as to whether or not this proposition should carried forward simply because it may not work. Now to me, that is not a valid excuse for voting against something like this. you want to have one-hundred-percent assurance, do what we're doing today. You know what -- what's going to happen. no question that this -- this part of the whole welfare picture is Now what Senator Geo-Karis is proposing is let's put this into a different context. Let's try to make it work. Wisconsin has made some mistakes, we're going to go to school on -- on their mistakes. But again, I have to say, if you hundred-percent assurance, do what we're doing today. There is no gamble whatsoever. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge you to vote for this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Palmer, for a second time. Senator Smith, for a second time.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I -- I'm -- I'm sitting here with -- with -- with interest and confusion. I remember years ago when they were talking about contraceptives - having the clinics in the school, and we had parents who were crying out to the State and to the City and to whoever will, to let them have their children without having -- so that they could go to school and get an education so that they could go to a college and be self-sufficient in their later years. And we came before this august Body asking for the support, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted it down and said that it was a hazard putting contraceptives in the schools. But it was the -- the clinic was not taking care of just contraceptives, but they were taking care of the entire body of that child. Because many of them had to go to the clinic to have

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

all kinds of examinations so that they could remain healthy. And thing of a contraceptive was a minute thing to that child. But the parent, in order to get a -- a -- protection for -save to keep from having a pregnancy, they would have to have the consent of their parent and the doctor. But we voted that These young people wanted to go to school. They wanted to stay in But we said no. Now we have something now, if you do not to school, you will not get a check, and you will still be without. These young people now that we are losing jobs, cutting off their aid, and if you are a single person, or if you are a married person with two children or anything, you cannot get any more money, and our standard of living has gone up today. what do you want the child to do? Many of these young people that sixteen years of age, have to stop school, try to find a job, so that their little sisters and brothers can survive. And you want to put them outside in the street and let them go for themselves. This is not consistent. A child wants to school. He wants to have an education. But you're taking off the taking away the substance for them to have a desire to want to continue to school. So if they do not stay in school, live otherwise, they will not receive any they have to money whatsoever. And I think it's wrong. If the child can a -- a applicable excuse to the authorities or whoever they are, and that child has to step out of school for awhile, I don't think it's fair for you to want to cut off their survival. I don't think that that's right. I think that you should think it over again, my dear friend - and I love you - but think another way of trying to help these children to help themselves and encourage them to want to live and want to be a surviving citizen here in the State of Illinois. I don't think that that is right to take them away and take their substance away from them. Just like heard my -- my friend, Watson. If a lady has over two children,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

and yet you don't want them to have an abortion, but if they have a child, then you don't want to support the child. The people are mixed up. Find your way and tell us what is consistent and then we can do better. But to take the substance away from these young people that are sixteen years of age and want to go to school, but they can't go because of economic conditions, I don't think it's fair for you to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Palmer, for a second time.

SENATOR PALMER:

Madam President, I apologize for rising a second time, but I think that this situation merits a few more moments of discussion. It has become popular these days in the press to vilify the Great Society, and to say that it had no merit. Unlike the Wisconsin bill, which put this practice -- this bill into practice in Wisconsin, there is in fact evidence that much of the educational program of the Great Society worked quite well. So for those who are asking what the solution is, and who want indeed to support education, I suggest that you once again support fully Headstart, which had twenty-five years of successfully helping young people not only go to school, but go beyond elementary school. I suggest that we once again fund the scholarship programs that significant increase among low-income and minority people in finishing their college education in the 1970s and in the '80s, in the -- rather in the '70s. When the '80s came around, the minute it was discontinued, there was a significant drop. I suggest that we fund and restructure and put into practice the educational component of Project Chance, which we have a chance to do during this Session. There are, in fact, many ways where we may indeed help these young children and their single mothers stay in school. They are right here at hand and we need not and should not believe that we can punish people into staying in school.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Davidson. Senator Geo-Karis, to close.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have heard remarks here that -- which absolutely appall me. all, I don't know that this bill was in any -- in the Republican National Platform. This comes out of me. I live next door They've been trying this bill, and they're low on it, Wisconsin. and they have been doing it for about three years. All this is is a pilot program to teach young people the art of learning to work and getting off the welfare rolls and giving them a means to work and to learn. It's a learnfare bill. It's a pilot program. talked with the Department of Public Aid and they -- they it very nicely for less than ten thousand dollars. what is wrong with trying to teach young people to get out welfare and have a job? What is wrong with having them trained? The bill does not apply to the recipients who have a high school diploma or a GED, or to people who are enrolled in a DPA --Department of Public Aid approved educational work training program. And if any of you think I am heartless, you ought to better than that. I do have distressed areas - quite a know me few - in my own district. I know what it's all about. I've youngsters thirteen and fourteen years of age pregnant. Who's going to be responsible for them? Who's going to help train them? We're trying to have a pilot program. What's wrong in trying a pilot program to teach youngsters to get a job, to train them, and to learn responsibilities, so they don't become a foil for some smooth-talking salesman. What's wrong with that? I say, Ladies

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

and Gentlemen, this is a step in the right direction. It's a pilot program. The Department of Public Aid is for it, and we're not heartless - believe me, we are not. And those of you who know me better, know it better than anyone else. All we're trying to do is help youngsters so they can achieve their own niche in life without being on the welfare rolls, but being instead on the work rolls. And I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1509 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, 21 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1509 is declared passed. Roll call has -- request for -- verification of roll fall -- call. Senator -- Senator Alexander, for what purpose do you -- sure - that's what we're doing. Madam Secretary, would you read the -- would you read the -- the -- the votes, those who are voting in the affirmative.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Barkhausen, Butler, Davidson, DeAngelis, Donahue, Dudycz, Ralph Dunn, Thomas Dunn, Fawell, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Lechowicz, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Maitland, Philip, Raica, Rigney, Schaffer, Schuneman, Topinka, Vadalabene, Watson, Weaver, Welch and Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Does the -- does the Senator question? Senator. Senator DeAngelis. Remove his name. Any -- Senator -- Senator Smith? Senator Macdonald. She's in her seat. Anv further? Jacobs. Senator Jacobs. Remove his name, Further? Further, Senator -- Senator Rigney. He's -- he's in the back Does the Senator question the presence of any Chambers there.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

other Senator? The roll has been verified. On that question, there are 30 Ayes, 21 Nays. Having received the constitutional majority, the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1516. Senator Topinka. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1516.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 1516 seeks to address a problem that not only did the Chicago Tribune highlight through a variety of -- of stories regarding abuse of immigrants who have settled in Illinois and the various type of methods that have been used to rip them off. Senator del Valle, my joint sponsor on this, I think, can also tell as many war stories as we have had from our district, that can verify that the Tribune article and series was We've had numerous newcomers come who have been promised relatives coming over who have had money taken from them on fear that they would be deported. They have dealt with people who have been less than reputable. What this bill seeks to do is to define what services can be performed in assisting an immigrant in filling out immigration papers for compensation. Require that such a person register with the Attorney General and submit verification of malpractice insurance, or a surety bond. how a contract should be written. Give consumers the right to rescind a contract within seventy-two hours. Prohibit certain practices by persons who provide help in filling out these papers, and a number of other things. We have worked with the City of Chicago on this. Gotten suggestions from their ordinance that

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

they have. We've dealt with some of the social service providers to make sure that the good people who are providing help to immigrants in terms of getting them established, settled, or whatever their needs would be, that they would not be hurt, and indeed we do feel that at this point we've got the bill where it should be. To our knowledge, no one is in opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1516 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1516 is declared passed. Top of page 11. Senate Bill 1618 <sic> (1518). Senator Luft. Senate Bill 1619 <sic> (1519). Senator Luft. Senator Bill 1520. Senator Watson. Senator Luft. Sixteen. 1519. Senator Luft.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1519.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. The Business Corporation Act permits directors of the corporation to hold meetings via telecommunications. However, the banking community, because of the documents that are incorporated in the decision-making and all the discussions that take place with documents, have decided it would be in the best interests of that community, if in fact they prohibited conferences through -- by teleconference. So what this simply does is remove from the Banking Act the ability to have conferences of directors via telecommunications.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1519 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 51 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1519 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1521. Senator Jones. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1521.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Madam President. Senate Bill 1521 is a bill designed to give the Chicago Park District more flexibility in setting meetings, and what it does is delete the requirement that all their meetings be set at the beginning of the fiscal year. And what this does is delete that so that they can call meetings in the first half of the fiscal year to give them authorization to make necessary transfers of appropriations if necessary, and that's all the bill does, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1521 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 51 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1521 is declared

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

passed. Senate Bill 15 -- 1531. 1523, I'm sorry. Senator Hawkinson. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1523.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. I believe two years ago the General Assembly created the Statutory Custodial Claim, whereby, a spouse, parent, brother or sister of a disabled person can file a claim against that person's estate. A judge in Peoria County wrote me asking why a child of the disabled person was not included in that category. I thought it was a oversight and I spoke to the House author of the bill, who said it was an oversight and this is intended to add "child" to those lists of relatives who have cared for a disabled person, who may file a Statutory Custodial Claim. I'd be happy to try and answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1523 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are -- there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, House -- Senate Bill 1523 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1531. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1531.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 1531 was introduced at the request of the Auditor General. It simply permits, rather than requires, the Development Finance Authority to finance motion pictures. It was also amended which requires IDFA to consult with the Illinois film office of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and the Illinois Arts Council before entering into any contracts.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1531 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. 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 required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1531 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1532 is on the Recall List. Senate Bill 1536. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1536.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This bill is a -- supported by the IEA.

It -- what it does is it holds harmless the nonadministrative school employees, except for the schoolteachers, the administration and the school board and the teachers for administering medication to schoolchildren during school hours, if

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

the -- at the request of the parents. And -- it's a -- basically a good Samaritan immunity program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1536 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1536 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1539. Senator O'Daniel. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1539.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1539 reduces the maximum interest rate penalty bid at delinquent tax sales from eighteen percent to twelve percent for all real estate property. Now the prime interest rate has dropped dramatically since -- since the eighteen-percent penalty was enacted in 1981. At that time the prime rate was around eighteen percent; now it's hovered right around twelve percent, and I think this is a reasonable bill that -- that merely reduces the cap from eighteen percent to twelve percent on tax sales. I would move for its passage. If not, I would try to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Question of the sponsor, please.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

If no one wants to bid in the property at twelve percent - and by the way, if you're not familiar with this procedure, you bid down. If no one wants to bid in at twelve percent, what happens to the property?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Well, they can bid lower or else it'll -- it'll -- the taxes won't be paid and it'll actually end up belonging to the county. They don't have to bid twelve percent; that's the cap on it. But, you know, my feeling was that we're in very difficult times and -- and I think, you know, a twelve-percent interest rate is -- is pretty good return for your money on your investment. And I just feel like -- that this is a reasonable approach, and all it does -- it doesn't change the law at all; it just changes it from eighteen-percent cap to twelve percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, just briefly, I know we don't like to penalize anyone, but on the the other hand, the idea behind all of this is that we get the taxes paid. And there's some old property out there that maybe, you know, if you can't make anything more, then the twelve-percent rate will just never be bid in. And the taxes will not be paid, and it will probably eventually go to a scavenger sale. So, there is a body of opposition out here that points out that there is a problem with this particular bill, and I'd just call it to your attention.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

you, Madam President. I rise in support of the bill. Thank This bill is identical to the one that -- that I sponsored last year and passed out of the Senate and went to the House, where it didn't see the light of day. But the county treasurer and clerks in my area who deal with this indicate that there is no problem in selling these taxes at interest rates much lower than what the law And there seems to be a limited number of people now provides. who are bidding on these taxes, and there are some who think that pretty much a -- a privately operated group that would certainly make plenty of money at a lower tax rate. And the bill should be supported. We should try it. If we then find that nobody can sell taxes, we may have to -- to allow a little higher rate, but I think the present eighteen-percent rate is pretty exorbitant, because as I recall, that's eighteen percent -maybe Senator O'Daniel can shed some light on this. But I think it's eighteen percent twice a year, isn't it Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Yes. After six months, you know, it's -- it's twice the rate, and from twelve to eighteen months, it gets up to three times the rate. You know, I just think this is a very reasonable bill. We're in very difficult times now, and a lot of people are having trouble making ends meet. And one thing you have to do, if you don't make a penny, or if you don't have a job, you've got to pay your real estate taxes or they are going to take your property. And I just think this is a reasonable bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Thank you. Just to say that I do support the bill. I think its time has come.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator O'Daniel, to close.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

I would just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1539 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 10 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1539 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1546. Senator Maitland. Senate Bill 1548. Senator Davidson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1548.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Madam President and Members of the Senate, this is identical to a bill which we passed last year 59 to nothing on the Agreed Bill List. This comes from the Employees Award Board. Under the present law which we passed when we created the Employees Award Board, retired State employees could not participate in this program. This allows the retired employee, if they can make a recommendation that's going to save the State's money, they in turn would be -- opportunity to benefit from cash award, which is set in the Statute. Appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1548 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 51 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1548 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1550. Senator Woodyard. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1550.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Bill 1550 actually, I guess, has a genesis going back over twenty years. When the Department of Conservation first acquired several thousand acres with the idea of creating a facility known Middlefork Reservoir, that never came to fruition, and later the Middlefork River was designated on the national level as a Scenic River status. During the period after designation as a national wild scenic river, there were a lot of discussions of what we could do to that area to increase recreational and tourism participation as a multi-use area, certainly with the realization that we would not be able to interfere with the Middlefork Corridor, so designated by Washington. One of the options that was discussed several years ago was trying to entice national bird dog trials into the Middlefork Valley. That process is a very gray type of area. To be designated - in which you can get national bird dog trials - you must be designated a primary site. We presently have five primary sites, but it's done within a Department itself; it is not statutory. the So thus the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Department has a lot of discretion in either designating a primary site or de-designating a primary site. What Senate Bill 1550 does, it codifies what is presently being done at the five other primary bird dog trial sites, and it also adds the Middlefork Valley into that. I had been unsuccessful over a period of years, in working with the Department, in trying to get the Middlefork Valley declared in that manner, and I felt that this was my only option to get that primary designation - was to codify, at the same time bringing the other five sites in, and certainly if this bill passes, those other sites will retain that primary status from now on. And I would...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1550 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 46 Ayes, 6 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1550 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1552. Senator Hall. Senate Bill 1554. Senator Berman. Top of page 12. Senate Bill 1557. Senator Luft. Senate Bill 1564. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1565. Senator Cullerton. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1565.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam Secretary and Members of the Senate. A number of years ago we passed a bill that dealt with the issue of BB guns. And what we said was -- is that BB guns that have a

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

certain minimum muzzle velocity of more than seven hundred feet per second would be classified as firearms, and as a result, you'd have to have a FOID card in order to purchase that. That has caused a problem, because you have to be a certain age to get that FOID card. So I worked with the National Rifle Association and the Illinois State Rifle Association on this bill, and what we've agreed to do is to say that all of these BB guns - no matter what the muzzle velocity is - if you're under age sixteen you can't purchase it, unless you have the written permission of your parents. Under age thirteen you can't buy it at all. However, if you're over age thirteen you can possess them. So that's agreement that we worked out. That's what this bill does. strikes from the definition of firearm the distinction that I'd made about the seven hundred -- the muzzle velocity of over seven hundred. It simply says that the new law will be if you're between the ages thirteen and sixteen, if you want to buy a BB qun, you need your parent's permission. If you are sixteen or over, of course, you can go ahead and purchase it. Be happy to answer any questions, and I can assure you...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. Question of the sponsor please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Are all BB guns now designated by this -- so many feet per second? I mean are all BB guns identified that they shoot so many feet per second so they'll -- this'll be easily enforced law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

You missed the point of the bill. The current law designates that if a BB qun has a muzzle velocity in excess of seven hundred that you need a FOID card to carry it. That's current law. What this -- and that might cause enforcement problems. What this bill does - at the request of the rifle -- National Rifle Association - it eliminates -- if you look at the bill on the last page of the bill, you'll see that we strike out that language. It's on page 3 of the bill that amends the FOID Card Act, We strike that out; we say there will be no more distinction between seven hundred feet per second or less than that. we're saying, to make it really clearer to people, if you're under age sixteen and you want to purchase a BB qun, you have to have written permission from your parents, no matter what the muzzle velocity is. But you no longer need a FOID card to get -- to get it if -- if it's in excess of seven hundred feet per second, no matter what your age is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Madam President and Members of the Senate, I rise in support of this bill, and in answer to Senator Watson's previous question, the easiest way to differentiate between them: A BB gun is under seven hundred feet; a pellet gun or a gun that -- air rifle that you could pump up exceeds seven hundred, and that's the big difference. But this is a worked-out agreement with the NRA. Everybody's on board. I urge all of you to vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Daley, what's to prevent someone's brother to write - whose fifteen years old...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton, I'm sure.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

First of all, you called me Senator Daley. I'm honored, but I'd like to call my brother the Mayor, as a matter of fact, and answer that question. But could you repeat the question, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

What's to prevent someone's older brother or someone -- let's say someone who is fourteen years old to go in a store with a written letter from his brother or sister saying that it's his mother or father, and purchasing this weapon?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, the law — the amendment that we had drafted says that if you're between the ages of thirteen — if you're thirteen, fourteen or fifteen, you have to have the written consent of a parent or guardian in order to purchase one of these weapons. Now remember, the law right now says that if it's under seven hundred feet muzzle velocity, you don't need anybody's permission. You can go in there right now — a thirteen—year—old can go in there and purchase a BB gun, if it's under seven hundred feet muzzle velocity, right now without any permission, so this is a compromise. Now you've asked specifically can this written permission be, you know — can someone violate the law by getting some forgery. Well, I imagine that's always the case, and I would just think that the people selling these things are going to be

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

responsible for making sure it's the parent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Cullerton, and what's the enforcement? т mean. how are you going to prevent something like this from happening, and what was the reason for putting this bill in, if there's no way to stop this from going on now? I mean, even when the bill's put in, you're not going to be able to stop it. I mean -- I mean I could you truly wanted it to work, you would say that if you're -- if you're under the age of whatever the heck, you're going to have your parents purchase this for you and give it to you, since in the law already you're telling me that you can't -- you can't buy this unless your parents say it's okay at age of thirteen, but you can have it and possess it. Right? So all I'm saying is if you want it to be enforced why didn't you just make it real and say you have to be an adult to purchase this and if you want to give it to your son or your daughter, that's a different story. I don't see an enforcement, and I don't see any safeguard on this bill whatsoever. So what was the reason for putting it in? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, the reason why I'm working on this is that a number of years ago the doctors at Children's Memorial Hospital brought to my attention the fact that these BB guns are getting very, very powerful. This muzzle velocity issue — anything over three hundred and fifty feet per second can break the skin. And there are children who are literally killed by BB guns. So in response to that, I put a bill in. Okay? Then the National Rifle Association showed up and we sat down to negotiate. As you know, we don't pass a lot of things around here that the National Rifle

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Association is not in favor of. So as a -- as a practical matter, to try to bring about a bill that would -- might have the effect of making unsafe weapons not so available to small children, we worked out this agreement. Now, if -- if it was up to me - if it wasn't an agreement - I would probably take out the written consent portion. But that was the deal that we struck with them, and I would hope that -- the fact is, these sellers of BB guns, if they don't want to believe that somebody's letter is from their parent, they don't have to, and they don't have to sell it to them. So I think it will have the effect of discouraging young children from going in and purchasing very dangerous BB guns. They have to check with the parent first, and I think that will have the desired effect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, Senator, I'm just here trying to make a point.

I -- I really don't think that this is going to do anything, to tell you the truth. I mean you're going to try make the guys in the store responsible for it, but right there it says if they have the letter from their parent -- a parent's note. You know these stores are just going to want to sell these guns to begin with, and they're not going to take business away from somebody, so they're going to accept that letter, to say, "Okay, this is your father's signature," just like now they sell cigarettes to somebody who's under seventeen or whatever. So if we're trying to keep the guns out of the kids' hands, this isn't the way to do it. I just don't think it's going to do a hell of a lot of anything, to tell you the truth.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. Well, Senator Raica, just a point or two about these -- these items. These -- we're no longer talking about the old Ryder-style BB gun, where you give it one -one use of the action and you've sustained enough pressure to move a BB out that really is not that dangerous unless you are real close to it. But with some of these BB guns that are now produced and manufactured, you can pump these up repeatedly to where they are truly a deadly weapon, and I will tell you that I know of several cases where death has resulted. well-known lobbyist here in Springfield that we all know who has had a nephew who was, I think, thirteen, that was the recipient of one of these BBs directly to the heart and died instantaneously. And I think that's the situation we are trying to correct. As to the enforcement, I think that if we send a message to parents and hopefully enlighten them, because there are lot of parents that don't know the capabilities of these weapons and won't want their children to have these kind of weapons unless they have the proper training. I think I got my first BB gun at about age eight or seven. And it's a good thing to have if you know how to use it properly. And I agree with you in you are coming from on the enforcement issue, but I think this will also send a message to parents, and hopefully, the child isn't willing to follow the law, the parent will teach the child to follow the law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, thank you, Madam President. I -- I believe that this bill, while not a panacea, will have the effect of perhaps discouraging very young children - thirteen-, fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds - from gaining access to weapons which can be

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

potentially very dangerous, or requiring them to get -- by prohibiting them from purchasing it and requiring if they want to obtain it, to get it basically with the permission of their parents. I think it's a reasonable compromise, and as was indicated, it does have the support of the Rifle Associations. For that reason, I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1565 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 51 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1565 is declared passed. Senate Bill 16 -- I mean, 1581. Senator Cullerton.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1581.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill is a legislative response to the increasing difficulty — that businesses have in funding postretirement health care benefit liabilities. Previously companies financed their health care benefits on a pay—as—you—go basis. Now there's been revised accounting rules which require corporations to record their liabilities against earnings, necessitating an accurate estimate of the entire value of future care benefits, reduced to a present value, and to record a portion of the total liabilities against current earnings. The overall effect of this change in the accounting rules would be potentially to force companies to reduce

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

the benefits. So there is a financing option which is available, and that's what this bill addresses. That financing option is to allow companies to issue life insurance policies that would be owned by the company. These policies offer substantial tax advantages. In Illinois there's really no statutory provision regarding insurable interest, so what this bill does is to permit an employer to insure the lives of its employees. We did add an amendment in committee. It was requested by the Department of Insurance. It's supported by the business organizations. We've also had conversations with the AFL-CIO and they have no objections to it. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions. It's a good bill and I would urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? Senator Di Turi.

SENATOR DI TURI:

I -- I would like to make -- on the last bill I voted affirmative. I pushed my button and nothing recorded as an affirmative vote. So I just wanted to make that, for the record, clear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The record will so show. Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson. Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, the amendment requires the consent of the employee - is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, and I think it might even require it to be in writing, as I recall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

And I think the original version had maybe nonmanagement employees or something, and now in its current shape, for any employee to be insured, the consent of the employee is required. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Right. Previously the bill permitted an employer to insure the life of a management employee without the consent of the employee. Now the consent is required as a result of that amendment. And I think that the -- the -- also the amendment dealt with the issue of allowing that insurable interest to exist even after they are an employee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

I think I am in support of the bill, and I understand the reasons behind the bill, but it's probably the first time that we're allowing this kind of insured interest. Now partners can do it, and small businesses, and you often do it in family businesses and so forth, to keep the business going in case something happens to one of the partners or limited corporation, the number. But here now for the first time we're setting up really a -- a large company or stranger with an insured interest in your life. Along with the consent, there -- is it your intent that this consent be truly voluntary - in other words, that it not be required as a

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

condition of employment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No. I -- I believe that it should remain and will remain truly voluntary; it's just that I don't think that's going to be a concern, because the -- the purpose of this is to allow the company to finance their postretirement of -- of -- health benefits. And I think it will be easy for the company to explain to their employees that this is why they are doing it. The alternatives would be to perhaps reduce those postretirement health benefits.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Is it then limited in amount to the value or the prospective value of that employee's future benefits - the amount of the insurance?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

By the way, before I answer that question, just a further answer to the previous question. There is a specific -- there's specific language dealing with not retaliating against an employee for failure to decide not to participate. And I think that there is a -- I'm looking for the language that limits the amount -- they can't just do it forever. It's limited to an amount commensurate with employee's projected unfunded liabilities to nonmanagement and retired employees for welfare benefit plans. So it's tied into how much the actual costs of the postretirement plans are supposed to be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1581 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1581 is declared passed. Senate Bill 1584. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 1585. Senator Etheredge. Senate Bill 1588. Senator Carroll. Senator Severns, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

State your point, please.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

It's my honor today to have with us in the Senate, three very hardworking Pages from Oak Grove School in Decatur. Behind me or to my side are Travis Stanley, Mike Harbeck and Brett Stenger, and I'd like the Senate to join me in welcoming them today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Will the Senate welcome our guests to the Senate. Senate Bill 1589. Senator Severns. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1589.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. As we debated long and hard last summer, one of the last bills to pass out of this Chamber was Senate Bill 45, which -- the intent of which was to halt the provision for one year to Medicaid providers of this State to gain interest for overdue payments. This bill simply reinstates the language, which permits every provider in this State except Medicaid providers to have interest on payments that are late. Currently in the State of Illinois, we have roughly four hundred and four million dollars' worth of Medicaid payments, some which are late over one hundred days. This would simply provide that those providers have the same opportunity every other vendor in the State of Illinois, and that's simply to be eligible for interest, if sought, for old bills. It passed out of the State Government and Organization Committee with a healthy vote, and I would hope that it will pass out of the Senate today with a healthy vote as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Discussion? If not, the question is -- Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Could you -- could you tell me, do you have any idea what this is gonna cost if everybody puts their bid in for this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Senator, to date, there have not been many that have put the bid in. If everyone were to put the bid in, so to speak, for the interest that is due them, it is estimated that it would cost the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

State seventy-seven million dollars - if everyone put that request in. To date, they have not put the request in, but if they did, that is what the estimate -- estimated total would be. I'd like to remind the Members, of course, that numerous providers have had to go out and borrow at a hefty pace to pay bills simply because the State of Illinois has failed to pay theirs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. A question of the sponsor, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

You know, I -- I admire for -- for what you're trying to do here. It kind of flies in the face of Senate Bill 45 that we had last year, which of course we had to use to balance the budget, and I don't think anybody was real happy with that, but, you know, we did ultimately have to do that. Now you just mentioned to Senator Fawell that upwards of seventy-seven million dollars could be involved if everyone, you know, exerted the rights under this bill. What would prevent them now from not doing that, if indeed they have not done so in the past, knowing that we would have the law, you know, backing them up? I mean, would we not then be bucking seventy-seven million dollars?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Well, first, Senator Topinka, I'd like to correct the first part of your statement. It does not fly in the face of Senate Bill 45. When Senate Bill 45 was implemented, it was implemented with the notion that it was for one fiscal year only. Now from the information that we're provided by the Department of Public

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Aid, based on letters they're sending out to providers, they -they're interpreting it that this would go on forever. That was
not the intent of Senate Bill 45, which I was one of the conferees
that signed that report. The intent was that it be for one year
only. What we're trying to do with this bill, is to make certain
that that intent is met; that it be for one year only.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

She indicates she will vield.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Severns, what's the effective date of this legislation if it passes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

I want to make certain. It's effective immediately upon becoming law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

So the interest and penalties would apply to the '93 fiscal budget?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Are you aware of how much that is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

The -- the amount that I've been given is -- is a potential of seventy-seven million dollars, in the event that every provider would apply. Senator DeAngelis, as you know, every other provider, but for medical providers, have that right today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I concur with that, but we have made special provisions to allow them - and it's costly - to borrow. But I really believe by increasing seventy-seven million dollars more of expenditures in next year's budget, you just make it more difficult to pay your bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Ms. -- Madam President. Let me -- I want tell you a situation that happened in my district office, and I want to tell you why I want to -- I'm urging everybody to support this -- this proposal. I had a guy come in - he's a bulk gasoline dealer, goes out and sells gasoline. He owed the State of Illinois forty-two thousand four hundred and seven dollars, and he was delayed in making his payment. He had to make it by the twentieth of the month. That's the new law that we just passed. If you don't make it by the twentieth of the month, here's what happens to you: He got -- this -- no -- no -- I understand what you're saying; this is not the wrong bill, but here's what happens if you don't pay. If the little guy out there traveling around, trying to make a living, doesn't pay the State of Illinois, what

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

happens? This is what happens. The penalty for late payment is ten percent. So that was automatically four thousand two hundred and forty dollars for being delayed just a few days. interest payment of 1.25 percent per month, or a fraction of the month to the date of the payment -- until it was due, which was a total of one thousand sixty dollars. So for this little old guy out there trying to make a living, send his kids to college, ended up having to pay almost seven thousand dollars in penalties and interest to the State of Illinois, simply because -twenty-five days late. Now I want to tell you: right now pharmacies - and obviously I've got a conflict of interest in this particular legislation because of my own drug store - but I'm telling you, I'm here to tell you that there's pharmacies in this State that are closing right and left, there's nursing homes that will be sending people out on the street simply because the State of Illinois isn't meeting their obligations and making the payments for the Medicaid providers. This is an excellent we're giving them a break. We're giving the State of Illinois a break with this legislation and for -- ten percent penalty! can't believe it! For some little guy out there, or woman, trying to make a living, we put that kind of a penalty and onus on them, and then we don't pay our own obligations. That's wrong. bill ought to pass. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

Senator Severns, to close.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. I would just ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR COLLINS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1539 <sic> (1589) pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 51 Ayes, 2 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1539 <sic> (1589) is declared passed.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

PRESIDENT ROCK:

On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, the middle of page 12, 1590 is on the Recall, I'm told. Senator Vadalabene. 1591. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1591.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1591 authorizes the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway Advisory Commission to accept and expend public and private funds for the purpose of developing the lake management plan. And I would appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1591 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish?

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1591, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1604. Senator Kelly. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1604.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1604 is recommended by the Citizens' Council on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. It makes three technical changes in the Interagency Coordinating Council Act. It brings on agencies to become members of the Council, including DCFS, DCCA, Corrections, ICCB, Employment Security and the University of Illinois Division of Specialized Care. It changes the reporting date from January 1 to March 1st, and it makes technical changes besides that. I would appreciate your support, glad to answer any questions you might have.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1604 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1604, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1605. Senator Marovitz. 1606. Senator Kelly. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1606.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kellv.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you again, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1606 makes two changes - one with townships and one with local municipalities. With townships with populations of fifteen thousand or more, vacancies in the assessor's office must -- would go -- be appointed a qualified person. And with townships with populations under fifteen thousand, the appointment would be to a person who agrees to become qualified for the appointment. And as to municipalities, this reduces within Cook County the population from fifteen thousand to ten thousand for municipalities in order for them to have the power to maintain, operate and finance senior citizen housing within their municipalities. I appreciate your support, glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1606. Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator Kelly, just -- may I ask a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman indicates he will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

This is -- this is a -- a backdoor referendum when you lowered the numbers from fifteen thousand to ten thousand for the senior housing?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Yes, Senator Fawell. There is no change. This is still a backdoor referendum, just as it is presently. It won't affect that matter at all.

PRESIDENT BOCK.

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

And it's just for Cook County.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Yes, this will only apply to Cook County.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

All right. To the -- to the bill: I just want to let my Members be aware of the fact, this is a backdoor referendum. It is very similar -- it is exactly the same language as for municipalities with fifteen thousand or more, but it is a backdoor referendum.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1606 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 8 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1606, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Raica, on 1615. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What 1615 does: Currently under Illinois law, whenever defendant is convicted of a certain sexual offense, that defendant required to undergo a medical test for sexually transmitted diseases, including that for an HIV test. What this bill does requires the court to inform the defendant of abovementioned test results, and this bill would allow the State's Attorney to petition the court to obtain the results of that test if the test results are relevant to another criminal prosecution. This bill will make it easier to convict defendants of criminal transmission of HIV, and I would just ask everybody for their support.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1615 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1615, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of page 13, Ladies and Gentlemen. 1620. Senator Karpiel. 1622 is on the Recall List. 1624. Senator Woodyard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1624.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This bill was proposed to me by the superintendent of the Paris school district. We have a rather unique situation in Paris - I quess the only one like it in the State. Paris Unit 95 is a special charter district. It is surrounded totally by an elementary unit district, and that elementary unit district is only -- the only one in the State with no high school. There are only six or eight special charter districts in the State. Anyway, the rest of the county only has three other school districts, and what their proposal does, and what the bill does, is allow the tuition of students across that -- that non-high school unit district to -- to tuition into Paris charter district. The superintendents and boards have all been notified of this bill, and it's understanding they're all supportive of it. It does affect only one county in the State. It will give the boards another option, should they decide to tuition their students into another district.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman's moved passage of Senate Bill 1624. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1624 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1624, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1628. Senator Leverenz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1628.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill, as amended now, would make it permissive that municipalities could exempt, if they so wish, the electric energy costs on the intensive usage in heat-treating processes. Answer any questions you might have with the bill, and ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1628. Discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

A question for the sponsor, please.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I'm sorry, Senator, did you say this is permissive?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

That is correct. We have -- we are giving authority, by this bill, to the municipalities to consider each case individually if they want to exempt it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Butler. Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1628 pass. Those in favor, 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. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1628, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1629. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1629.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1629 permits the leasing of the premises to a subsequent liquor license holder, provided that the local liquor commissioner approves it and the State Liquor Commission -- Liquor Commissioner approves it as well, and the place has not acquired a notorious establishment -- notorious reputation as an establishment for that kind of activity. I urge its passage.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1629. Discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, is -- is it the requirement under this bill that it be a truly new license holder, as opposed to just an alter ego or spouse of the original license holder who had his license revoked?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yes, it is. That's why the Illinois Liquor Control Commissioner is involved in it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1629 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, 2 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1529 <sic> (1629), having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1635. Senator Macdonald. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1635.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Discussion?

Reading, Senate Bill 1641.

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1635 was requested by the clerks of the court for Cook, DuPage and Kane County, and it allows them to -- it's permissive, and it allows them to accept payment of fines by credit card. We did put an amendment in saying that any person who had been convicted of credit card fraud, of course, would not be allowed to pay by credit card. This will enhance the ability of the clerks, in their opinion, to collect their fees. And so I ask for your favorable vote. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senate Bill 1635 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1635, having received the required constitutional majority, declared passed. 1638. Senator Carroll. 1641. Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please. Middle of page 13, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Senate

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall

Bills

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1641.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. When tax-exempt property is transferred or the use of the property is changed, the new owner or user of the property must notify the county assessor or the supervisor of assessments, and a legal description of the property is required in that notice. What this bill does is simply say that they must also include the address of the property. This is intended to make it easier for the assessor to identify a property which is exempt, to see whether or not it should remain exempt. And it's a very simple bill, and I would be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1641 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1641, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1643. Senator Cullerton. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1643.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This is a very simple bill. It was a request of the assessor of Cook County. It simply deals with the -- an oath that he is required to take. It was imposed in 1939, and it just revises that oath. They still have to take an oath, but it takes out some of the antiquated language. Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1643 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1643, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1645. Senator Smith. 47 is on the Recall List. 1648. Senator Thomas Dunn. Bottom of page 13, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 1648. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill changes the standard of proof in the Juvenile Court Act under the provision dealing with gang transfers, and this deals with the transfer of a juvenile to the adult division for prosecution. The original standard of proof was beyond a reasonable doubt, and this would change it now to probable cause for the judge making the decision. Be happy to answer any questions, urge an Aye vote.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1648. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1648 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1648, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1650 or 51. Senator Jones. Which? Top of page 14, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1650. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1650.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1650 is one of three pension bills that deals with the various systems, and when we come to an agreement - it's merely a shell bill right now - but when we do come to an agreement, this will be one of the bills that we will use. And I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1650 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 46 Ayes, 2 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1650, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1655. Senator Joyce. 1660. 61. 62. 1663.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Rea. Middle of page 14, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 1663. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1663, which came out on the Agreed Bill List in committee, permits a nursing home to modify a patient's contract, provided the client is given the proper written notice and permits a patient to consent to a change or terminate the contract after receipt of the notice, and it is supported by the Illinois Health Care Association. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1663. Discussion? Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Some of the people or maybe -- some of the patients in these nursing homes - and I don't mean to be disrespectful - but more than likely have lost some of their mental skills. And I'm wondering if some of these individuals that receive written notice from the nursing home that their contract is being changed and I am increasing the amount of their monthly payments - what is consent, and are they in a position, truly, to consent, and who is

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

looking out for their interests if, in fact, they don't have the ability to give their consent?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Well, as -- as I understand it, Senator Luft, that if the patient is not capable of executing the contract, then it's -- it's made on behalf of the resident of -- which the contract was originally developed from. So $\frac{1}{7}t$ -- it does have that provision for it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

I just saw this for the first time, but I think a person is judged to be disabled under the Probate Act. I don't know what that means. I don't know who is going to go through all the nursing homes and talk to all these people and then judge whether they are disabled under that Act. So I have some serious concerns with the procedure for raising the rates on these individuals.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, is it true that now if a patient or a resident of a nursing home has a long-term contract or has a contract for several years at a certain rate, right now that rate cannot be raised, can it?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

That's my understanding.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR REA:

Unless it's written into the contract initially.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

So folks, then, who have a long-term contract, this wouldn't benefit them at all. This would -- this would allow their rates to be raised on thirty-days notice and would do away with the benefit of their having negotiated a long-term contract for care. Right? I guess that's rhetorical. I guess it doesn't -- it doesn't benefit the resident.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Rea may close.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. There is a -- and of course there is a provision in there also that the patient, or whoever is negotiating the contract on behalf of the patient, can terminate it if they're -- after the thirty-day notice. And I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1663 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay, And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 8 Ayes, 31 Nays, 7 voting Present. Senate Bill 1663, having failed to receive the required constitutional

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

majority, is declared lost. 1664. Senator Vadalabene. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The amendment to this bill makes the legislation permissive and not mandatory. And it authorizes the drainage districts, local mass transit districts, the CTA and the RTA to utilize their established funds for personnel and other resources to require <sic> (acquire) and construct and operate and maintain bikeways and trails. And I appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1664. Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Sam, I dearly love you, but this is a lousy bill. TΩ bill: This is a bill that actually will allow all these various districts to put on the -- put bike trails on. We had a very lively discussion in the -- in the committee about this bill. I really think you ought to take a very good look at this bill. intention certainly is -- is very good, and I certainly respect the -- the sponsor and -- and his bike trail volunteers. But the problem with it is that we are expanding these bikeways into districts such as a drainage district, mass transportation district, just about any kind of district that you want. acquire, construct and operate a bikeway. That is not the purpose of these districts, and I would suggest that you take a good, long

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

look at this and at least vote Present.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. We did have a discussion in the committee, and a good, long discussion as the previous Senator said, and as a result of that discussion, Senator Vadalabene agreed to an amendment to ensure that the bill was totally permissive. And that was adopted and I think, as a result, I thought that this would have no problem. So I would indicate that some of the times these drainage districts, local mass transit districts and the CTA and the RTA may have occasion to want to cooperate with other governmental and private agencies with regard to bikeway and trail programs, because they have land that can be useful for those purposes. And since it is permissive, no one will have anything done over their objections. So for that reason, I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Di Turi.

SENATOR DI TURI:

I feel that by passing this bill, it'll make it safer for our children when they do travel out on these bike trails.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene, to close.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, it's absolutely totally permissive, Senator Fawell, and you knew that in committee and you know it now. And I would appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1664 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay, And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 14 Nays, 6 voting Present. Senate Bill 1664, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1669. Senator DeAngelis. 1677. Senator Leverenz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1677.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. This will would provide that -- the Attorney General, the Office of the Governor or any State agency that hires outside legal counsel would have to file with the Auditor General's Office a statement of necessity. The amendment makes it on contracts in excess of five thousand dollars. Answer any questions you might have on the bill, and urge your Aye vote. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1677. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1677 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 4 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1677, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 16 -- I'm sorry. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, our senior legal counsel had a birthday yesterday, Phil Weber. He's forty-eight years of age, and I would like you to wish him a happy birthday by your applause. Phil, stand up. He doesn't even know I'm going to do it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Happy birthday, Phil. You don't look a day over a hundred. Senator Davidson, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, on that Order of Business, I think we ought to pay respect to one of the elder gentlemen who works for this - George Beckey is sixty-six years old today.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

George, happy birthday. We'll get to Madam Secretary later, I assume, without saying how old. 1679. Senator Leverenz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1679.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

I thank you, Mr. President. This bill has passed in the form of a House bill and also of a Senate bill in the past. It would provide for the counties of Cook, Lake and DuPage Counties to cooperate, and within a one-year period of time, come to an agreement on setting standards of water runoff, one county into another; for example, Lake into Cook County, or in the case of Busse Woods, Cook County into DuPage County. If it -- that is not accomplished within a one-year period of time, by petition the Department of Transportation would take over and set those

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

standards so that we would have a final solution to stormwater runoff. I would urge your Aye vote for passage of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1679. Discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Are you including Lake County in this, and if so, why?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Yes, Lake County is in it. You're in Lake; I'm in Cook; and the water runs north to south, and that has to be in there so that we can arrive at the solutions that one county does not, in effect, have a detrimental effect on the other county.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will this bill preempt home rule?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

That is correct.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Lake County and DuPage County are in the process now of enacting tough flood control ordinances, and I don't know why he should mix us up

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

with his -- with his bill. Just stick to your own, Teddy, and leave us out of it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

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

He indicates he will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Leverenz, I met with the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District a couple days ago. First of all, they told me this is not the same bill as has been introduced in the past. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Yes and no. In the previous bill, we took the Water Reclamation District out. In this bill, it is the entity that negotiates the contract within the first year. So hopefully that answers your question. In principle, it is the same bill that passed out of here, Senate Bill 416, and the same bill in the House, 3367. They -- in essence, this has passed both Chambers, but the Water Reclamation District is a key player in this, and they are in it, as I just explained. And the Department of Transportation now has the numbers on water runoff through all of the streams, et cetera, and just not at the county line.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

All right. The way they explained it to me is that we -- we have the numbers and we -- we'll be getting the numbers between the counties. In other words, Lake County cannot -- will have to

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

go into an agreement with Cook; Cook will have to go into an agreement with -- with DuPage; DuPage will also have to agree with southern Cook. And if an agreement is not reached, it goes to somebody. Who does it go to? It goes to the Department of Transportation. So in other words, it has to be a negotiated agreement. It isn't -- it does not right now say that everybody has to remain the same. That's right. Well, the -- the former bills, everybody had to remain the same, and that's -- that's, I think, a very large difference. The numbers had to remain the same.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Leverenz, you wish to close?

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. The prior speaker made mention of everything had to remain the same. I have never heard of that discussed. I would think that the Water Reclamation District had solicited her Aye vote. Inasmuch as my new Senate District that I am running in is in DuPage County, for those that I would represent in DuPage County, this is a very serious piece of legislation that should be passed, inasmuch as Busse Woods empties right into DuPage and Salt Creek has been a big problem for a great number of years. And I would encourage everyone to vote Aye.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1679 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Ayes, 18 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1679, having received the required constitutional majority, declared passed. Top of page 15. Senator Cullerton, on 1683.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

I'm sorry. Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well I just question that if that does, in fact, preempt home rule, does it take thirty-six votes?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

It did not — it is the opinion of the Chair that by virtue of the wording within the — within the bill, wherein it says, "The regulation of stormwater runoff as provided in this paragraph is an exclusive power and function of the State and is a denial and limitation of home rule powers. Pursuant to Article VII, Section 6, subsection (h) of the Illinois Constitution, a home rule county to which this paragraph applies must comply with every provision of this paragraph." A declaration under subsection (h) of the exclusivity of the power of the State requires only a simple constitutional majority. Top of page 15. Senator Cullerton, 1683. 1684. Top of page 15, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1684. Read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1684.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Very simple bill. It just simply adds the Persian Gulf War veterans to the list of -- for preferential hiring for the Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. It's at their request. Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Senate Bill 1684 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All vote who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1684, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1688. Senator O'Daniel. Madam Secretary, read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1688.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1688 addresses an obvious omission of duty or other official misconduct by a township officer as a business offense punishable by a fine of not more than a thousand dollars, and removal from office. Township law is solid concerning the removal and penalty of township officers found guilty of misconduct, and the language contained in this bill is identical to the current law relating to certain municipal officers. This bill was drafted by help—drafted by the Township Officials. Got out of Local Government's Committee on the Consent Calendar, and I'd ask for a favorable roll call. If not, I'll attempt to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1688 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1688, having received the required constitutional majority,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

is declared passed. 1692. Senator Smith. 1693. Senator Hawkinson. Madam Secretary -- middle of page 15, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1693. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1693.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill attempts to define and further clarify factors that can be used in aggravation for imposing an extended term. It provides that a felony which -- or has been an enhanced misdemeanor may be used if it is of a similar class felony occurring within the last ten years, and the charge was brought separately and tried and arises out of a separate series of act. The committee requested an amendment that we put on that clarifies that if you enhance a misdemeanor to a felony, you cannot use the same conviction - prior conviction - as the factor in aggravation, but there must be still another offense before it could qualify for an extended term. Ask for its passage. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, this comes to us from -- is it a Peoria State's Attorney? Peoria County State's Attorney?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

At his suggestion, yes.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Could you just tell me what the facts were with regard to a particular case that gave rise to this idea?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

The situation that the Peoria County State's Attorney brought to my attention was an instance in which someone had been guilty of twenty-three separate offenses of retail theft, and yet he was unable to use that enhanced sentence to qualify for an extended term.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson, do you wish to close? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1693 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, Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1693, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1699. Senator Etheredge. 1700. Senator Severns. 1708. Senator Philip. Senator Philip, 1708? 1711. Senator Senator Philip? 1716. Etheredge. 1717. Collins. 1718. Collins. Page 16. 1720. Senator Tom Dunn. 1732. Severns. 34. O'Daniel. 1734. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, top of page 16, Senate Bill 1734, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1734.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Bill 1734 prohibits the regulation of pesticides by any political subdivision of the State. What it really does -- pesticides as a result of this legislation would be regulated by the Department of Agriculture. There is several different entities that are supporting this: the Illinois Department of Agriculture, Department of Transportation, Fertilizer and Chemical Association, public service companies, Nurserymen's Association, landscape contractors. the Illinois Agriculture Association, electrical co-ops, Retail Merchants' Association, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and many more. If there's any questions, I'll attempt to answer them. If not, I'd -- I'd move for the passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I had an incident in my community a few years ago with a -- a pesticide company who was spraying at the same time our children were going to school. We had a number of parents that came and objected, because several of the children got very ill, and there was some chemists in our -- in our community who said this was -- was not a good substance to use in our area and that there was a better one. These were Argonne scientists who, frankly, knew more than our own Department of Agriculture and our -- our own EPA. It was finally to the point where this second chemical was used. It is now used throughout the United States because, in fact, they were entirely right. With this bill I do not believe that the question could even be raised and the parents would not have this right to object,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

because the community could not stop this spraying. It was for the moth something or other -- some moth. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Senator Fawell, it seemed to me like -- from your question that you should be a supporter of this legislation. What this would do would require -- we'd have one regulatory agency in the State, instead of fifty or a hundred different municipalities with different types of regulation that were overlapping. This -- this would be strictly regulated by the Department of Agriculture. And some of the things you're concerned about, they couldn't do that, unless they -- they -- it was cleared with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. And I think it -- that probably this would -- would solve some of your concerns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Fawell. SENATOR FAWELL:

Well, it was the gypsy moth. Our -- the town of Wheaton told this chemical company they could not use what they were using, and they did give them permission to use this other chemical and it worked. And therefore, I cannot believe that this is a good bill. I mean, I don't think that our agencies are all that knowing and all that powerful that they should override the local powers of home rule and of all of our communities and say these things are -- are going to be used when our own citizens are saying, "No, they should not be" - with good reason. And I urge a No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I would stand in opposition to this too. It just seems

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

to me that if individual cities want to have separate restrictions on somebody spraying your lawns in that town, for whatever reason, they should be able to do so. I know one of the instances of that has been brought up by the opponents to this - and I think the Environmental Council is opposed to this - is that individual -- individuals may be -- may have a reaction to the chemicals in the fertilizer. And if they do, they need to be notified so they can either get out of town or stay in their house or not be out when the pesticide is sprayed. I don't think that's asking too much, because what you're doing is if somebody has your -- their lawn sprayed, they put a flag out in the yard to tell people not to walk on it. Well, that doesn't usually keep children or pets from walking on it, but what it does end up doing is cause neighbors to have to breathe the pesticide that's sprayed through the air - the pesticide or fertilizer that becomes airborne. So if individual cities, and it seems like there's only five that are doing this -- I don't see how this is a major impediment to this lawn care industry. And it's obviously the industry and the fertilizer dealers and the pesticide dealers who are behind the legislation. They don't want anybody telling them what to do. seems to me that we should allow the cities and the city councils to decide what's best for each town. You know, we're probably doing enough to them this year as it is, without taking away their authority to determine what's best for their local constituents. So I would also urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I reluctantly stand in opposition to this bill, because this affects the City of Chicago and the County of Cook and their home rule. Unfortunately, we have a problem in the City where we have our own rodent department, and

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

they have devised certain chemicals that have -- in fact, they build an immunity to it, so they've got to change it every two years. Under this proposal, we would have -- the City of Chicago or the County of Cook would have to come through the Department of Agriculture and seek their approval. I -- I don't have any objection to the genesis of the bill, but I think when you're trying to hamstring local municipalities in fighting their own warfare with their own money and their own chemicals, this is a step in the wrong direction. I'll be voting No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Т certainly rise in -- in support of Senate Bill 1734. Actually, what occurred, and what precipitated the bill, was -- was federal court case in which the court ruled that there was nothing the present laws that would prevent a unit of local government from initiating some kind of controls on pesticide-herbicide Well this immediately - throughout the United States created a lot of furor among all states. As a matter of fact, as we know, there are over twenty-six states that have now adopted this kind of legislation. Now I know that there are people that say that local government certainly has a role, and should have, in -- in controlling pesticide usage. But if you'll stop and think, library boards and drainage districts and fire districts and school boards all fall within that category of unit of local government. And while people say that, "Well, those folks would never want to impose any kind of controls," they might very well do so, and that court case certainly does not preclude them from doing that. So most other states are doing exactly what are trying to do here today, and that's put the control of -of these pesticides within one entity, and that's the Department

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

of Agriculture at the State of Illinois. In regard to -- to the question of Cook County, we certainly were -- that was discussed - should they be amended out. We never got an amendment that I saw that would -- would amend the City or Cook County out. And my thought is, that may very well occur over in the House. And fine with me. I -- I certainly -- I won't speak for Senator O'Daniel, but -- but I have no problem with that, if we can develop something like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator ... Further discussion? If not, Senator O'Daniel may close.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I'd think if we're concerned about the environment and not having overlapping regulations from every community and having one agency that regulates these pesticides -- and you know, it's getting to be more of a concern about the environment all the time, and using pesticides can be very harmful. I think it -- that this is a reasonable approach to this, and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1734 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 27, the Nays are 27, none voting Present. Senator O'Daniel. Request postponed...

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Postponed Consideration. 1736. Senator Savickas. 1740. Senator Luft. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill -- I'm

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

sorry - 1740, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1740 is a vehicle bill. Last year we passed the McCormick Place legislation. It's in the process of a shakedown cruise. There's a friendly suit been filed on the food tax, and I was asked to introduce this bill in case we need to make some fine adjustments between now and the end of the June. So I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1740 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 43, the Nays are 3, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1740, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1749. Senator -- 1754. Senator Geo-Karis. Madam Secretary, 1754.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1754.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this simply amends the Boat Registration and Safety Act to provide

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

that revenue from fines resulting from citations issued by a county sheriff or his deputy or a municipal chief of police shall be deposited in the county fund in the county where the citation was issued. The total violation revenues don't amount to more than forty thousand dollars annually, and the majority of them would be from citations issued by chiefs of police. Ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1754 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 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1754, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1760. Senator Smith. 1763. Madam Secretary, 1763.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill assesses a hundred-dollar fine for those who are convicted of a crime involving sexual assault. It creates a Sexual Assault Services Fund which would be administered by the Department of Public Health through the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault. The funds would be awarded to the community-based support groups around the State of Illinois. The purpose of the bill is to find a new revenue stream to fund these services for victims. Secondly, provide some relief for the General Revenue Fund, and finally, allow abusers to become

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

part of the solution. This is patterned after the Statutes and funding mechanism governing the services for domestic violence victims. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and if not,...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1763 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 1763, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1764, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Currently in law we have a ban on white goods that goes into effect July 1, 1992. Due to several problems with finding recyclers, we've had to propose legislation that will change the ban until July 1, 1994 - a two-year extension. In the meantime, what we are going to do is to create a White Goods Task Force to investigate and propose needed statutory, regulatory and programmatic changes to implement this Act. The idea is to keep refrigerators, stoves, air conditioners out of the landfill; however, we didn't have anybody who would come forward and take the Freon or other gases out of the machinery or the mercury switches. Those are two of the worst components of the -- of the white good problem. So what this does is extend the ban and creates a committee to study the issue and

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

come back with future legislation. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1764 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 1764, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1769. 1770. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 16, is Senate Bill 1770, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1770.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1770 was introduced at the request of every member of the Cook County Board - Democrats and Republicans both. It would permit the County Board to impose and pass an early retirement program similar to what the State passed last year. As you know, it was very effective as far as the State employees being offered the Early Retirement Program. In fact, forty-five hundred employees participated in that program. With that provision, that many people were not -- did not have to be laid off by this State due to budgetary constraints. The County of Cook is also faced with a budgetary constraint. They thought it would be best if an early retirement program be offered and adopted and approved by the Board. In order to accomplish that,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

we have to have your help in passing 1770. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1770 pass. Senator -- Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Does this apply to the commissioners as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

No, unfortunately, we're elected.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

And the president? Pardon?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

It does not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there further discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1770 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 46, the Nays are 5, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1770, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1771. Senator Jones. 1776. Senator Friedland. All right. Top of page 17, Senate Bill 1776, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1776.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

(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 1776 clarifies that police and fire exams shall be open to all applicants by changing one word - that's from "free" to "open." It's necessary to do this to establish some legislative intent. And in the committee, Senator Jacobs offered an amendment which strengthened the bill, and I'd urge your favorable consideration of this measure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1776 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 -- have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 49, the Nays are 3, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1776, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1782. Madam Secretary, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, 1782, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1782.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 1782 would allow the Department of Historic Preservation to put, in very select spots, on a trial basis - with the ability to kind of pull back and not do this should it not work out - fees and admissions

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

for various historic sites in the State of Illinois. It's very limited. The sites have been looked at in terms of would they be big enough to support such fees in terms of the amount of tourism that they get. School groups would continue to be free, in terms of tourists - for instance, those coming to the State Capitol; however, individuals would be charged. The fees are -- are very, very small. Thirty-eight states currently have versions of this. Internationally speaking, most historic sites have some kind of a fee or admittance or entrance charge, so it's nothing really particularly earthshaking when it comes to what other people have been doing for years. And that's basically the summation of the bill, and I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Topinka, my analysis says that it would be reasonable to charge fees at eight of fifty-three historic sites. Could you tell me what those eight are?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. They include the Dana-Thomas House in Springfield; the Old State Capitol in Springfield; the Lincoln-Herndon Law Office in Springfield; Cahokia Mounds in Collinsville; the David Davis Mansion in Bloomington; Grant's Home in Galena; Marketplace, Galena; and Lincoln's New Salem in Petersburg.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, do we have any -- I'm sorry. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Do we have any indication as to what the fees will do to the attendance; for example, of schoolchildren coming down to Springfield wanting to go to the State Capitol - for some reason they might choose not to - or the Dana House? Do you have any idea what that would do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

As I said earlier, schoolchildren coming in school tours would continue to be free, straight across the board. However, if children came down individually with their parents, passing through, or on -- you know, on personal tours, then they would, indeed, be charged a lesser rate. So we're talking about two dollars for adults, one dollar for children, except at the Dana-Thomas House, where adults would be three dollars. Again, the child's rate would be one dollar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

How much money would we be raising by this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

I'm not completely sure, because some of this is still up for grabs in terms of which way the Department of Historic Preservation will go, because a lot of this will be dependent upon where they feel they — they will not lose tourism, where they

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

feel they can sustain this and make some money, where they feel that there's enough tourism to justify the implementation of these fees. And likewise, we make it permissive so they can pull back if, indeed, there is a drop-off.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton. Senator -- further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Question - and I apologize if someone has asked this question. We were concerned about whether or not, in committee, would we be -- would there be a special exemption for schoolchildren visiting some of these historical sites.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Any school tour coming to these historic sites would be free. So the busloads of kids that we see, they would be coming in free. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, Mr. President. Would the -- the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

She indicates she will yield. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator Topinka, again, we've had a lot of respect for everybody today. So with all due respect to the sponsor of the bill, I'd just like to know, are we -- if this passes, are we then going to start charging for everyone that comes into these Chambers, because these are historic grounds? And I think that maybe if we did that, we could get some more money and maybe even keep, you know, some of the racket out. Who knows. Is that going

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

to be included in this bill too?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

No, because the Capitol is not -- does not fall under the auspices of the Department of Historic Preservation. I mean, it does not, so they're not even in the running on here, though it's not a bad idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Indicates she will yield. Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you. Senator, do you know how much we paid for the restoration of the Dana House?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Altogether, I think we paid six million dollars in terms of buying Dana House and then further restorations. So the State has about a six-million-dollar investment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Do you think that this will recover that amount in -- or come close, or any idea what we can recover?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

I don't know that when you make an investment in historic

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

sites, that you necessarily go into it on the theory that you're going to recover it, because history is a funny type of a concept, and you — you buy it and you use it for different reasons than you would an ordinary piece of property. So I mean it's kind of hard to assess. The reason for these particular fees is not so much to recoup original investments, but it's to keep these sites open and to make sure that these sites are — are taken care of in such a way as your home or my home or any other building would be taken care of over a period of years, because just the — the sheer wear and tear that they get from tourism coming through it and normal depreciation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you. Senator, we're becoming kind of confused in our language in recent terms, and I see the use of "user fee." And I know that the user fee now is a tax -- or is a tax a user fee, or are we taxing the young pupils - students - that come? And is that what we're doing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

For the fourth time, student tours are not paying anything. They will come through free. It will be the same policy as there is now. However, if youngsters come with their parents as visitors because they're on a vacation, just as they pay in thirty-eight other states and innumerable foreign countries to visit historic sites, both here and other states and elsewhere, they would be paying an -- you know, a fee, just as they pay forty dollars a child to go into Disneyland. And apparently, that doesn't deter anybody from going there, for far less historic merit.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Would the sponsor mind clarifying whether groups of kids would have to pay or not? That -- that was a whimsical comment, actually; although, I got the appropriate reaction. I think important thing - there's nobody here and there's no one in the Department that wants to charge fees. But the bottom line is, these days of tight budget dollars, that the only alternative to this is to take money away from public aid or mental health education to keep these important sites open. So I think the question isn't will someone have to pay to get through the door; the question is, will the door be open at all on a lot of these sites. It's hopefully a pilot program, and maybe in happier times, we won't need to do this at all. But I think it -- it's the only responsible step to keep these great assets that we have acquired for the people of Illinois over the last hundred years available to the people of Illinois, in a very tight budget cycle which, regrettably, shows no sign of going away in the immediate future. So I rise in support of the bill. I hope that in future years we will conclude that there's no longer a need to do this. But certainly right now the alternative is to have padlocked, and I don't think any of us want that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in strong support of Senate Bill 1782, and I would ask the Members on this side to weigh carefully the admonition that Senator Schaffer delivered so well. The alternative is just truly unacceptable. And we will, in the next -- tomorrow for sure in committee, and next week on this Floor, be

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

confronted with some very, very difficult choices with respect to the budget -- as it was presented to us. And I don't think there's any one of us that would want to charge a user fee, but the alternative is truly unacceptable. And so unless we are prepared, individually and collectively, to take money from those very worthy and needy budgets, this is the alternative, and it's a tough one. And I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Topinka may close. SENATOR TOPINKA:

Well, I would just point out that in order to keep their doors open and successfully so, the Museum of Science and Industry, the Field Museum, the Shedd Aquarium, the Planetarium, the Brookfield Zoo, and just about all others in Chicago have done this, and they have managed to sustain themselves. I think we owe the same type of a responsibility to the people of Illinois with the historic sites we have here, and I would seek your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1782 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 1782, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1783. Senator Topinka. Senator Severns, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

We were -- we were on an Order of Business earlier, and I would like to go back to an Order of Business, and the subject is birthdays. Madam Secretary has a birthday today, and to celebrate it we have cake at the -- at the side of the well, and I would like everybody to have a piece in her honor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Linda Hawker has a birthday. Happy birthday. Senator Brookins, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BROOKINS:

On that same Order of Business, Mr. Secretary. I notice that all the gentlemen - it was announced how old they were and all that. And we have someone that's standing before us that's evidently sixteen, eighteen or nineteen or so, I would just like to say happy birthday and how old are you, Linda? If you want to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Nineteen.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Nineteen. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Howard, she's younger than you are. Of course, we all are. Further — further discussion? All right. Cake over here in the — to the left of me. 1793. Senator del Valle. 1806. Senator Ralph Dunn. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1806, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1806.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Ralph Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, Senate Bill 1806 strengthened the State Prompt Payment Act by requiring that State agencies pay their bills in a timely manner or pay a two-percent interest fee. This is a bill that's been around for a long time. There was one a while ago that addressed the health care problems. This is the other people in the State that also need prompt payment of their bills, and I'd be glad to answer any questions, and urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1806 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, 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 none, none voting Senate Bill 1806, having received Present. the constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1808. Schuneman. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1808, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1808.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Several years ago, we -- during the insurance crisis in Illinois, we passed laws which require thirty days advance notice from an insurance company to cancel policies. This particular bill would exempt from that law certain commercial excess and umbrella liability policies. The bill was requested because of the practical problem that has developed that commercial excess and umbrella policies normally are dependent

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

upon what is called underlying insurance, and oftentimes that underlying insurance has not worked out thirty days before expiration date. So the umbrella policy writing company many times sends cancellation notices when they really are not The people that want to be taken out of this provision of the law are what we would consider sophisticated insurance buyers, rather than the normal homeowners and automobile policyholders that are our consumers and who still would have protection under the current law. Be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill -- I'm sorry, 1808 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 none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1808, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1814 has an amendment. 1821. Senator Schaffer. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1821, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1821.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President, a number of years ago, we passed legislation to require employee-operated insurance -- health care insurance programs to cover the children of noncustodial parents in the case of divorce. At that time, we did not include group medical insurance programs operated by labor unions. All this bill does

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

is include those type of group medical programs in the requirement to insure children of noncustodial parents that happen to be in that program. It doesn't require any new medical program to be created. We're just saying if there is a program operated by a trade union and the noncustodial parent is a qualified member, that his children be covered just like they would be if they were still married. I don't believe there's any opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1821 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 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1821, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1823. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is 1823, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1823.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

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

1823 is at the request of the County Board as well. Commissioner

Carl Hansen, the Chairman of the Legislative Committee, requested

1823, 25, 28, and 31 be introduced just in case the county needs

vehicles affecting various items in the Statute. Be more than

happy to answer any questions, if there's any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Bill 1823 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 48, the Nays are none, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1823, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1825, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1825.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Lechowicz. On the order... SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1825 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 45, the Nays are 2, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1825, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1828, on the Order of 3rd Reading, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1828.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1828 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

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

question, the Ayes are 47, the Nays are 1, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 1828, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1831, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1831.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1831 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 45, the Nays are 4, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 1831, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 17, is Senate Bill 1832, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1832.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1832 validates the tax levy and appropriation ordinances of Cook County and the Cook County Forest Preserve District and downstate forest preserve districts for the Fiscal Year 1991. This is a matter that we've passed regularly during the course of the years. The purpose is to preempt use of nonsubstantive procedural objection on the basis of a suit challenging tax levies and extensions. The County Board also this

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

year requested an opinion from the State's Attorney, Jack O'Malley, whether we have to continue with this. He recommended that we pass a bill doing this as far as validating the tax levies of Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill -Senate Bill 1832 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 2, none voting
Present. Senate Bill 1832, having received the required
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 18, at the top.
1836. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Madam Secretary,
please.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 4

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm sorry. 1861. Senate Bill 1861.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1861.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1861 simply defines victim of a sexual crime, and expands the

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

definition of confidential communication. I know of no opposition and would urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1861 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 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1861, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1889. Senator Hall. 1892. Leverenz. 1896. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1896, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER.

Senate Bill 1896.

(Secretary starts to read title of bill)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Hold it. Senator Davidson. Beg your pardon? Senator? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1896.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson, on Senate Bill 1896.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Never make an error, but I'm never wrong. But I apologize. Ladies and -- Mr. President and Members of the Senate, this is the increase in license fees for Department of Conservation, and fishing license fees; reestablishes a half license fee for hunting and fishing which will allow us to access to four hundred thousand-plus dollars from the Federal Government of the Pittman-Robinson <sic> (Robertson) funds, which we have been losing each year since 1975. This will allow the Department to

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

continue to operate the different State parks, which right now are scheduled to be closed, due to the lack of funding. Appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Is there something in here concerning a requirement that a person sixteen years or under must have written permission to obtain a hunting license? Is that the current law, and does this remove that? And if so, why?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

It's not in here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I voted against this provision in committee. I thought it was bad then; I still think it's bad. You know, the only people that go to -- not the only people, but a lot of the people that go to the State parks are people who can't afford to do much else. And now we're going to start charging them fees to go to the parks. As we indicated earlier, I don't know where this thing is going to end up. We're going to end up with charging for people to go to the libraries; we're probably going to be charging them to go to the restroom downstairs in State buildings. I just think -- I just think that if we're going to do these things, and if we need the money, let's do something.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Let's quit playing these silly games. This is not a user This is a -- a -- just a charge just for the sake of charging, and I just don't see where it makes any sense. And for those of you who have not heard from your senior citizens, I'm going to tell you - you will - 'cause I'm just starting to hear from them because, number one, you're reinstituting fishing license fees on them; you're doing a lot of other things in this bill, and also they're the ones that use the State parks a lot, too. And they're just starting to get riled up. And I just urge a No vote on this. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel. SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. T rise in support of this legislation. You know, I come from down in Southern Illinois, and myself and probably Senator Rea have more parks or areas more suitable to them, and I hear from a lot of people. But the -- the big concern I hear is, "Don't close our parks. Please don't. Whatever you do, don't close our parks." And they aren't opposed to a little bit of a fee increase the difficult times we're in, but what they are really concerned about is closing these facilities. And -- and if a small user fee will help us to keep those -- those facilities open, I think it's a step in the right direction. I very strongly support this. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Will this quarantee that the State parks that were identified for closure will now remain open, if in fact, this fee increase

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

passes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

They will all be open. Some of them may be a seasonal basis, but they will all be open.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

How many is that, and if, in fact, it's not too many, can you just list off those that were identified for closure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

There'll be fifty-two sites that would go to seasonal operation. If this doesn't pass, it'll be fifty-two sites that'll be closed, and the names of them I can't tell you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay. I understand. That would -- there's an issue about Pittman-Robins <sic> (Robertson) money, I believe, which is federal dollars that we're trying to access. If we don't do this, what happens to those federal dollars under Pittman-Robins <sic> (Robertson) Program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, the Pittman-Robinson <sic> (Robertson) funds are rebated and as most of you may or may not know that Pittman-Robinson <sic> (Robertson) funds were passed back, I don't know, thirty-forty years ago by the Federal Government. It's a excise tax that every

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

hunter and fisherman pay when they buy equipment or any kind of shells or ammunition or fishing rods, or et cetera. If you don't charge for a hunting license, you don't receive anything, and since 1975, when we made senior citizens free, we have lost approximately four hundred thousand dollars a year of that matching fund, because it's based -- refund back to the State is based on the number of hunting license. Regardless what you charge, it's based on the number of hunting license. If you don't have a hunting license, you don't receive anything, so consequently those people fishing and hunting over sixty-five, we have lost that income each year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Schuneman. SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill. I think that this is a reasonable proposal. I happen to have a little RV, and travel around in -- in Wisconsin some, and the Wisconsin parks, which are generally considered to be among the best in the nation, have had this kind of fee process for many years. And people don't consider it unreasonable if they have to pay a little fee to go into a park. Now as I understand, the Department of Conservation does not necessarily intend to charge at every park, because in some places it may not be entirely feasible. But some of these fees have not been raised for some time, and if we want to keep our entire park system open, I think we have to come to grips with the reality that we need some additional revenues to do that, and so I stand in support of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Cullerton. SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Mr. President, I apologize for rising a second time.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

just that I had asked a question earlier of the sponsor, if there was anything in here concerning the removal of a requirement that a person sixteen years of age or under must have written permission to obtain a hunting license. And there is, indeed, on page 10 of the bill, a Section that strikes certain language dealing with "written consent of the father, mother or legally constituted guardian of that person." I think as I -- as I the -- the proposed Statute, what we're saying here is that now if you want to get a hunting license and you're under sixteen, you can do so with the written consent of your parents. proposed change is, is to say that you have to, basically, show that you have had a certificate of competency, which allowed under current law, before you can get this hunting license, and you can't go around getting the certificate of competency just by getting a written consent of your father, mother or legally constituted quardian. So I would ask sponsor if that's correct - if that's what his intent is, because the first answer I got said that there was nothing in here about that at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, my short answer to you earlier was based on what I was given by the Department of Conservation, and then the longer explanation of the answer is, as you know, under the present law there is no hunting license required for those individuals under sixteen years of old. This takes out the written permission that you also forgot to tell them in the law, that if you're under sixteen you don't need a hunting license, but you must - must - be accompanied by a parent or a guardian or a -- or -- does it also include another licensed hunter or not? So it's more or less a clerical cleanup, than affecting -- 'cause no requirement for

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

under sixteen years old to have a license now is required.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator, he -- he surrendered. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I apologize for speaking for second time. But this whole thing is a little ludicrous. I'm hearing the Department tell me that we're going to close down or I'm hearing the answers, anyway, that we're going to close down our State parks if we don't get a user fee. I'm sorry, I don't agree with that. I don't believe that. I believe that that be the internal policy of the Department. I don't think that it's necessary for that to happen. I add to that the fact that we are now charging a new class of people for a fishing license, and if they go on State park property -- excuse me -- if they go on State park property to fish, it's going to cost them an entry fee to get in on top of it. And yes it does, Doc. If they are going in to fish in a State park -- now if they're going to go eat, that's a different story, and I understand what you're saying there, but if you go and you fish on their land, it costs you extra money to do that. I just think this is a -- well, it's a heck of a way to run a railroad.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock. Can we break up the conference? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator Cullerton is attempting to obtain his certificate of competency, and as I read the bill, it takes an eight-hour course to obtain that certificate, so I would assume that he's not going to do it this afternoon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

And a fee.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

SENATOR ROCK:

rise in support of this legislation, and if you look at the proposed increases, in my judgment, they are neither onerous unwarranted. We're talking about a dollar or two, and in one case fifty dollars, and in another case ten dollars. And it just seems to me, again, we are confronted with kind of a Hobson's choice. Where are you going to find the money to provide this recreational service to the people of Illinois? We going to take it from Or from Public Aid? Or from Mental Health, or DCFS? Education? We simply can't do that, and I daresay no one in this Chamber prepared to do that. So the alternative is to increase - modestly increase - some of the fees that we charge. I think the fee increases that are requested are modest. I do not believe they're onerous, and I also believe they're absolutely essential, indeed, we are to provide the recreational activity that the people of our State deserve. So I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Davidson may close. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, President Rock very adequately expressed why we should vote for this. I'd appreciate very much a favorable roll. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1896 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 43, the Nays are 10, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1896, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1897. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1897.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

(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, Senate Bill 1897 would establish a child welfare litigation division in the Attorney General's Office to represent the State, and to defend, on behalf of the State, all court action referred to it by the Department of Children and Family Service. Up to now, the Department of Children and Family Service's been farming this out in private legal contracts to the tune of at least—last year hitting 1.9 million dollars. This would probably reduce that amount of money by keeping it in-house. Now currently, there is a litigation division in the Attorney General's Office that handles Public Aid cases. This would add on to that, and it is felt that not only could we do it cheaper, but we could do it better, and certainly do it more efficiently. And I would ask for your favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, then the question is, shall Senate Bill -- I'm sorry. Beg your pardon. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator Topinka, how many attorneys are we talking about hiring - just one?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Any legal counsel that would be involved here would be handled by the Attorney General, so I have no idea. I imagine it would be in -- it would involve to the extent that we have litigation every year, and that varies from year to year.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- further -- Senator Collins. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Briefly, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think this is an excellent idea, because we don't have the money, and my golly, we got enough lawyers in the Attorney General's Office that could handle them. Even if they're just new lawyers right out of law school, they can do these things. So I certainly support the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka, do you wish to close? SENATOR TOPINKA:

Just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1897 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 none, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1897, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1899. 1901. Senator Weaver. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1901, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1901.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1901 comes as recommendations from the Illinois Thoroughred Breeders Fund

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Advisory Board. It makes changes in the allocation of funds to owners of Illinois conceived and foaled horses; changes the amount of the fund that goes to purse supplements, and it also changes the definition of a "foaled horse" in Illinois. If anybody wants to know more, I'll be happy to try to inform them. If not, I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1901 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 1901, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1902, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1902.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. Senate Bill 1902 amends the Community Services Act. And what this legislation would do would be to consolidate what is now a separate report on model women's programs in DASA's annual comprehensive plan; extend the interval between submissions of the community service plan from one year to three; and extend the internal — or the interval between submissions of the women's services plan from two years to three years. The purpose is to get greater efficiencies in these report forms, and to — saving about sixty thousand dollars annually.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1902. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1902 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay, and 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 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1902, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1903. Senator Donahue. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1903.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1903 is a bill that we feel is necessary to take out some things that are in the Statutes that are really unnecessary. If you look at your analysis, the vouchers and the approving of the vouchers that CMS is supposedly doing has all been delegated to the other various agencies. It's unnecessary, and we feel we just want to change the Statute to meet what we're already doing.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 1903. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1903 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1903, having received the required constitutional majority,

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 18, is Senate Bill 1904. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Bill 1904.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, this is the annual transfer or release of easements by the Department Transportation, plus an amendment we put on a couple days ago - in transfer of excess lots in the town of Old Shawneetown or Shawneetown - whatever's correct at the request of Representative Phelps and Senator Rea. The Department concurs. This is so that town can hopefully develop them with economic development with some private concern. Appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

As I go through my analysis, it appears everyone's paying fair market value. We're not giving any of the plots, are we? Everyone is paying fair market value?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

Correct. Except with -- with -- they're giving the lots in Shawneetown to the Village of Shawneetown. The rest of them are all paying fair market value.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

We're giving the lots to Shawneetown. How big are they? How much are they worth? Why does the State own them?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

To my knowledge, they really have no value. They were taken by the State as a gift given to them by Shawneetown after the 1937 flood, which flooded the town and moved the town up farther up on the bluff. This is Old Shawneetown, and we still have a historical preservation site there - the first and oldest bank in the State of Illinois is a historical site. These lots are -- some adjacent to it is being given back to the town or Shawneetown or Old Shawneetown, which was given to us in the first place after the 1937 flood.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1904 pass. Those in favor, 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. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1904, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1909. Senator Madigan. 1910. Senator Mahar. Bottom of page 18, Senate Bill 1910. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1910.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill would permit the Department of Mental Health to use funds appropriated for State-operated facility operations and administration for the purpose of assisting the discharge of persons from the State-operated facilities to the community-based residential settings. A Floor amendment put on by Senator Smith would cap the amount of funds which could be transferred to two percent. I would ask -- happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1910. Discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

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

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator Mahar, under this bill for transferring these patients, will the facilities be working in accord and with the parents and with the surrogate and whoever is the legal guardian for those who are the patients within these facilities?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Yes, Senator Kelly. That's -- that's my understanding from the Department. And consequently, all of the local parents' organizations that we know from our area are all in support of the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

If not, the question is, Further discussion? shall Senate Bill 1910 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1910, having received the required constitutional majority, declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, that brings us to the bottom of the page. While we did not get through the entire Calendar, it is ten minutes after five. The Chair is led to believe that the Appropriations II Committee wants to there will be announcements with respect to tomorrow's schedule. The schedule, as far as the Floor action tomorrow is concerned - we will convene at noon. And we will attempt handle the Recall List. If any of you have bills that you wish to recall, this is the appropriate time - between now and noon - to deliver to the Secretary so they can get it on the list. We will adjourn, I assure you, no later than one o'clock. I have assured Senator Philip we would be out in plenty of time for those of to make the trip to Chicago. So we'll start at noon, and we will adjourn by one o'clock. We will handle the recalls tomorrow. have some paperwork to clean up. Are there announcements? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Appropriations II will reconvene immediately. We only got a couple departments, so let's get down there right on time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Appropriations II will reconvene immediately in 212. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, on behalf of the Illinois Chiropractic Society, which has been my privilege to pay dues in, we invite all of you to

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

lunch tomorrow in the Rathskeller from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. So all those -- you who are free, please come and have lunch before you leave.

PRESIDENT ROCK.

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. By way of time announcement for tomorrow, 'cause there's been some discussion...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Ladies and Gentlemen, please. We're changing the times of the meetings tomorrow.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Appropriations I will be meeting at ten o'clock in Room 212, as the Calendar said. And then on behalf of Senators Hall and Welch, Appropriations II will be meeting at eleven o'clock in Room 212. Both will be final action meetings on the budget. We believe that Appropriations I can be done within an hour, from ten to eleven. And then Appropriations II will meet from eleven till whenever necessary.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. We will -- we will convene here at noon. And you have the Chair's assurance that we will be out by one o'clock, so that everybody can make their appointed event. All right. We will -- we will continue with paperwork, but for all intents and purposes, we will stand adjourned until noon tomorrow. Madam Secretary, resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1258 offered by Senator Demuzio and all Members.

And Senate Resolution 1259 offered by Senator Smith.

One is congratulatory, the other is a death resolution.

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 162 offered by Senators Rea and Demuzio.

And Senate Resolution -- pardon me -- Senate Joint Resolution 163 offered by Senators Woodyard, Ralph Dunn, Fawell, Watson and Karpiel.

They're both substantive.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive. All right. With leave of the Body, while we're here, why don't we do House Bills 1st Reading? We'll get rid of those, and -- with leave of the Body, we'll move to page 27 on the Calendar. On the Order of House Bills 1st Reading. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 230 offered by Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 707 offered by Senator Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1132 offered by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1504 offered by Senator Woodyard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2030 offered by Senator Di Turi.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2678 offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(House Bill 2737 offered by Senator Leverenz.)

(Bill within parentheses inadvertently skipped by Secretary)

House Bill 2784 offered by Senator Macdonald.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

House Bill 2904 offered by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me -- 2921 offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2940 offered by Senator Hawkinson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3045 offered by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3108 offered by Senator Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3183 offered by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3202 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3269 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3344 offered by Senators O'Daniel and Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3352 offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me -- 3353 offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3460 offered by Senator Davidson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3493 offered by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3506 offered by Senator Munizzi.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3583 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3672 offered by Senator Fawell.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

104th Legislative Day

May 13, 1992

House Bill 3695 offered by Senator Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3843 offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3985 offered by Senator Fawell.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4040 offered by Senator Weaver.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4104 offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4106 offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 4167 offered by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3731 offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. All those bills will be referred to the Rules Committee, Madam Secretary. Any further business? Further announcements? Senator Hall wishes me to reiterate that Appropriations II Committee will meet immediately in Room 212. Immediately in Room 212. Senator Vadalabene moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Thursday, May 14, at the hour of noon. Noon tomorrow, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Senate stands adjourned. Have a nice evening.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 37TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE 93/04/20 09:16:52

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 13, 1992

	FIRST		PAGE PAGE	160 160
нв-0707 Н≥-1132 НВ-1504		READING	PAGE	160
		D. T. A. D. T. M.C.		
			PAGE	160
			PAGE PAGE	160 160
HB-2030 HL-2678			PAGE	160
HB-2737	-		PAGE	160
HB-2784			PAGE	160
H3-2904			PAGE	161
HB-2921			PAGE	161
Ha-2940			PAGE	161
HB-3045			PAGE	161
HB-3108			PAGE	161
H5-3183			PAGE	161
HB-3202			PAGE	161
HB-3269			PAGE	161
Hu-3344	FIRST	READING	PAGE	161
HB-3352	FIRST	READING	PAGE	161
Hu-3353			PAGE	161
HB-3460			PAGE	161
HB-3493			PAGE	161
HJ-3506			PAGE	161
H8-3583		READING	PAGE	161
HB-3672			PAGE	161
Hb-3695			PAGE	162
HB-3731			PAGE	162
HD-3843			PAGE	162
HB-3985			PAGE	162
HB-4040			PAGE	162
Hb-4104			PAGE	162 162
H3-4106 HB-4167			PAGE PAGE	162
SE-0511			PAGE	7
SB-1485			PAGE	33
SB-1496			PAGE	35
Su-1499			PAGE	36
SB-1508			PAGE	36
Sa-1509			PAGE	40
Sa-1516			PAGE	65
SB-1519			PAGE	66
SB-1521	THIRD	READING	PAGE	67
Su-1523	THIRD	READING	PAGE	68
SB-1531	THIRD	READING	PAGE	68
SB-1536	THIRD	READING	PAGE	69
S1539	THIRD	READING	PAGE	70
SB-1548			PAGE	73
S8-1550			PAGE	74
Su-1565			PAGE	75
SB-1581			PAGE	82
SB-1589			PAGE	86
Sp-1591			PAGE	92
SB-1604			PAGE	93
SB-1606			PAGE	93
SE-1615			PAGE	95
SB-1624	THIRD	READING READING	PAGE	96 97
SB-1628 SJ-1629	THIRD	READING	PAGE PAGE	98
SB-1635	THIRD	READING	PAGE	100
SB-1641	THIRD	READING	PAGE	100
S3-1643	THIRD	READING	PAGE	101
SB-1648	THIRD	READING	PAGE	102
So-1650	THIRD	READING	PAGE	103
SB-1663	THIRD	READING	PAGE	104
SB-1664		READING	PAGE	107

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

STATE OF ILLINOIS

87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MAY 13, 1992

PAGE 109

> PAGE PAGE

PAGE PAGE

SU-1677 THIRD READING

JD TOIL	111110	KENDTHO	
SB-1679	THIRD	READING	
SB-1664	THIRD	READING	
S==1688	THIRD	READING	
SB-1693	THIRD	READING	
SD-1734	THIRD	READING	
Su-1740	THIRD	READING	
SB-1754	THIRD	READING	
SB-1763	THIRD	READING	
S-1764	THIRD	READING	
53-1770	THIRD	READING	
SB-1776	THIRD	READING	
SJ-1782	THIRD	READING	
SB-1806	THIRD	READING	

SENATE TO ORDER - PRESIDENT ROCK

JOURNAL - APPROVED

COMMITTEE REPORTS

SENATE AT EASE SENATE RECONVENES

ADJOURNMENT

JOURNALS - POSTPONED

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

PRAYER - THE REVEREND TOM CHRISTELL

EXECUTIVE SESSION - CONSIDER APPOINTMENTS

SB-1831 THIRD READING SB-1832 THIRD READING

SS-1828 THIRD READING

Sa-1361 THIRD READING

SB-1896 THIRD READING

SB-1897 THIRD READING

SE-1901 THIRD READING SB-1902 THIRD READING

SB-1903 THIRD READING

SS-1904 THIRD READING

SR-1252 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SR-12-3 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SR-1254 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SR-1256 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SR-1257 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SR-1258 RESULUTION OFFERED SR-1259 RESOLUTION OFFERED HJR-0133 RESOLUTION OFFERED SJR-0162 RESOLUTION OFFERED SJR-0163 RESOLUTION OFFERED SUBJECT MATTER

SR-1255 RESOLUTION OFFERED ...

SD-1910 THIRD READING

SB-1308 THIRD READING Sa-1821 THIRD READING SB-1823 THIRD READING SB-1825 THIRD READING

PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE 7 PAGE 162

PAGE 2 PAGE 159 PAGE 159 PAGE 2 PAGE 160 PAGE 160

110

114 115

116 117

122

123

154

155

156

2

2

2

2 2

2

1

1

2

3

3

140 141 141

93/04/20

09:16:52