106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The hour of noon having arrived, the regular Session of the 88th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the -- will the Members please be in their seats, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer today will be given by Reverend Loren Rasbury, Sunnyside Road Church of Christ, Decatur, Illinois. Reverend Rasbury.

THE REVEREND LOREN RASBURY:

(Prayer by the Reverend Loren Rasbury)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you, Reverend Rasbury. Reading of the Journal. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Madam President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, April 13th; Thursday, April 14th and Friday, April 15th, in the year 1994, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, it is so ordered. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Watson, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1181 Be Adopted; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1274 Be Adopted; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1567 Be Adopted; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1628 Be Adopted; and Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1682 Be Adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1273, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

Senate Resolution 1274 is offered by Senator Jones.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

As is Resolution -- Senate Resolution 1275.

Senate Resolution 1276, by Senator Klemm.

Senate Resolution 1277, by Senator Fitzgerald.

Senate Resolution 1278, by Senator Jones.

Senate Joint Resolution 141 is offered by Senators Ralph Dunn and Burzynski.

And Senate Joint Resolution 142, by Senators Rauschenberger, Topinka and all Members.

They're all congratulatory or death resolutions, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1279, by Senator Rauschenberger.

And Senate Joint Resolution 143, by Senator Rauschenberger.

They're both substantive.

Senate Resolution 1280, by Senator Geo-Karis and all Members. It's a death resolution, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Consent Calendar. Senator Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?
Ralph Dunn. Your microphone is not operating very well. Would you like to borrow the -- your colleague's microphone?

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you. I --I'd like to ask for immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 141. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of this resolution. Those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Dunn, to explain your -- your resolution.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

This is a congratulatory resolution that -- Senate Joint

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Resolution for the Pinckneyville Panthers, and they'll be here tomorrow. Wanted to get it sent today, so we could present it to them tomorrow. I appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn has moved for the adoption of his resolution. Those in favor, say Aye. Those opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution's adopted. Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

On a point of personal privilege...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point of ...

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

...Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point of personal privilege, sir.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

On the gallery facing us on the right, we have the young people from the Illinois Collaboration on Youth: the Chicago Youth Centers, Aunt Martha's, and the Chicago Area Projects. Will they please stand and be recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1281 is offered by Senator Berman.

It's congratulatory, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Consent Calendar. Any Messages? We will now proceed to the Order of 2nd Reading. We're going to proceed to the Order of 2nd Reading. The Members are advised to turn to page 2 of the Calendar. At the top of page 2 is the Order of Senate Bills, 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1133. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1168.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Cronin. Senate Bill 1172. Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1229. Senator Fawell. Senate Bill 1263. Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1311. Senator Molaro. Senate Bill 1318. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 1364. Senator Klemm. Senator Klemm. Senate Bill 1364. Senator Klemm? Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1364.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1477. Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1528. Senator Karpiel. Senate Bill 1528. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Senator <sic> 1528. Senator Karpiel. Mr. Secretary, will you please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1528.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1628. Senator Sieben. Senate Bill 1628. Senator Sieben. Senate Bill 1701. Senator Dudycz. Senate Bill 1715. Senator Ralph Dunn. Senate Bill 1746. Senator Donahue. Senate Bill 1819. Senator Klemm. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Senate Bill 1819.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1819.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Have there -- have there been any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senator Raica requests to go back to 1172. With leave of the Senate, Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1172. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. 1172.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1172.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1263. Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1263. Senator Raica ready? Mr. Secretary, will you read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government --there were no committee amendments, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment makes technical and typographical changes to the bill, as requested by the State <sic>Enrolling and Engrossing and the State Board of Elections, and I just ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any -- is there any discussion on this amendment? Hearing none, Senate -- Senator Raica moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Bill 1263. Those in favor, say Aye. Those opposed, say No. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1477. Senator Raica. Mr. Secretary, will you please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1477.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR RAICA:

Just a question of the Chair, Madam President. If -- if an agreement is worked out, is it the opinion of the Chair that we'll be able to bring that bill back to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Yes. That's my understanding.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Okay. I now advise the Membership to turn to page 3 of today's Senate Calendar. We shall now proceed to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. This is final action. Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 393. Senator Woodyard. Senator Woodyard.

I'm trying to -- okay. Madam President and Members of -- of the Senate, I would like to re-refer Senate Bill 393 to Senate Rules Committee. This is a bill that we hope this fall will be in place for pesticide monitoring and remediation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Hearing no objection, this bill is re-referred to Rules. Senate Bill 481. Senator Butler. Senate Bill 1110. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 1144. Senator Petka. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1144.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1144 would allow public schoolteachers and school — and school administrators to use, read from, or post historically significant documents — documents, writings and records. It would prohibit any censorship of American history or historically based textbooks of any religious references contained in those documents, writings or records. This bill is based upon

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

number of laws which have passed in four states -- Tennessee, Kentucky, Arizona and Arkansas. The reason for this bill is based on a study which was done by the National Institute of Education which basically found that there was systematic censorship of religion from American textbooks and government It is the opinion of the author of that study, Dr. Paul Vitz, that the censorship that is -- that has been done does not lend itself to accurate historical education. Because of that, this bill simply seeks to tell teachers and administrators have, in fact, the right to post historically do significant documents, writings and records of our founding fathers in the teaching of American History and -and American With Madam President, I'll answer anv Government. that. questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Can we have it a little quiet, so everyone can hear what the bills are all about? Sometimes we vote on some things we're not sure -- we're not -- what we're voting on, because we can't hear. Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Just a question of the sponsor, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Question of the sponsor. He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is one I don't have any qualms with, but I'd just want to remind some of the people on our side of the aisle, what -- what may be getting into, and -- and it's a question I would have of the Senator, in regards to -- to this piece of legislation, Senator. Would this allow them the -- the reading of the Bible as an example, to be read into in -- in -- in our schools, if this bill were to be passed? Could we then be mixing the religion into the

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

public school system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much for the question, Senator. I've heard that comment made before. Quite frankly, I don't know where it comes from. If you read through the -- the documents that -- that I've alluded to, and similarly based documents, they're talking about organic documents of the founding fathers: documents related to the founding fathers' speeches, documents related constitutional conventions of the early states, and similarly situated documents. Certainly, I'm not going t o pass legislation which offends the constitution. But in my opinion, the legislation that I have before you sir, is legislation which I think is necessary, so that we have accurate American history and accurate American government without censorship.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

So your concern then is to ensure that -- that these books -- these letters are in their entirety rather than bits and pieces that are chosen and -- and certain - which we say - indications toward religion or anything else, would still be allowed, they're part of the official record...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs, could you speak a little clearer and louder? Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, the sponsors can't hear the discussion on the bills, and it isn't fair to the sponsors or the people asking the questions. Could -- could I beseech you to be quiet while we can hear the bills. Senator Jacobs, would you please...

SENATOR JACOBS:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

... repeat your comments for Senator Petka?

SENATOR JACOBS:

So I understand it correctly, Senator: So your concern is to ensure that -- that these things are introduced in their entirety, rather than to be censored - part of it to be censored out, and to give them the whole history rather than part of the history. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka. Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Senator, that is certainly correct. I think that you will see in the studies that I alluded to, where they pointed out a number of instances where documents were altered which simply do not reflect the content of the original documents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- are you done, Senator Jacobs? Further discussion? Senator Palmer. And before Senator Palmer speaks, WCIA wants permission to videotape us. Do we have that permission? No opposition. Permission's granted. Senator Palmer, for further discussion?

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Let's have it a little quiet, Ladies and Gentlemen.

SENATOR PALMER:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Petka, according to the list that I have in front of

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

me on my analysis, beginning with the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence and so forth, are there any of these that to your knowledge we cannot quote from or post in their entirety at present?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Well, Senator, we are -- we are supposedly living in a free nation where we can quote liberally from any documents that we choose. What I'm suggesting, and what the study of -- that was done by the National Institute of Education in 1988, is that are in fact, there is content-based censorship of documents. What this piece of legislation attempts to do is to tell teachers and administrators in school systems that they're not required to use, simply as source materials, censored documents, but can go back to the originals if they choose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, again, Madam President. To the bill: Senator Petka, I have been a teacher, and in fact have used these documents freely, both in the public schools and in universities, and to my knowledge, no one has ever discouraged me from using them in any way that I saw fit, that fit the curriculum. I would be very leery of this bill, because it doesn't make sense. If these are the documents that we are talking about, then any teacher anywhere in the United States is proud to use them and uses them freely. I don't like hidden agendas, and this one suggests that there is a hidden agenda here. If you have another matter in mind, then I wish that you'd just say so, and let's argue that point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Any further discussion? Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley? Further discussion?

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I would just like to say that I'm pleased to support and cosponsor Senate Bill 1144 - a bill which prohibits -- censorship of the documents on which our republic is founded. Editing of these documents, for any reason, should be by the American citizens of our great nation, who are given the opportunity to read and study these -- these important historical documents, in their complete form. Thank you very much. I urge you to support this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I would like to ask the staff to take their conferences off the Floor, because we -- we want our speakers to be heard. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Petka, to close.

SENATOR PETKA:

Well, thank you very -- very much again, Madam President and Members of the Senate. As I explained when I made initial remarks about this legislation, I think that really the -- the General Assembly has the right to set the tone and policy of the State of Illinois. I think there has been a reputable study that has been done in this instance, in which censored materials have been given in the name of -- of correctness. I do believe that this Body can -- can send a message to teachers and administrators throughout the State, that they certainly have the full blessing of the General Assembly to use source materials in assisting the teaching of accurate American history, its education, and also American -- and American government. And for these reasons, I urge adoption of the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All right, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1144 pass.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Those opposed will vote Nay. The Those in favor will vote Aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who voting is open. wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that record, there are 39 Ayes, there are 8 Nays, 7 voting received Present, and this bill. having the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill Senator Klemm, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for purposes of amendment? All right. Senator Klemm seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1146 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an -- of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Klemm. On the Order Reading is Senate Bill 1146. Recalled to 2nd Reading. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Klemm.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1146 is an attempt to -- is an attempt to add some language to include concealment of homicidal death and aggravated arson to the list of offenses that have an unlimited statute of limitations, and this would allow the prosecution of those offenses to be commenced later on. This was a provision that was in a bill earlier by the Secretary of State of Cook County, and there's no opposition that I'm aware of, and I'll be glad to answer any questions, or I'd move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration,

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1147. Senator Hawkinson. Senate Bill 1175. Senator O'Malley. Senate Bill 1181. Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley. 1181. This is a recall. Do you wish it recalled for the purposes of an amendment?

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Ves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senate Bill 1181 is being recalled to 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1181. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Mahar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President, and Members. I have a school — elementary school district in — in my area that, in the past, has accessed a fund for leasing educational facilities. They no longer have a need to do so, and they wish to take the thirty thousand dollars in that account and abate it back to the taxpayers. Apparently, a change in the Statute is required; that's what this amendment does. And I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1181.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All right. All those in favor of this amendment, signify by saying Aye. All opposed, Nay. The amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary?

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1186. Senate Bill 1200. Senate Bill 1200, Mr. -- Senator Klemm. Senate Bill 1200. Senator Klemm. Mr. -- Senate Bill 1207. Senator Watson. Senate Bill 1211. Senator Thomas Dunn. Mr. Secretary, will you read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1211.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Body. What this bill says is that if you, as an individual, appeal your property taxes, and the matter goes to the property tax appeal board and you win, the assessor is precluded the following year from raising up your taxes and the assessment, unless there is a sale or until the next quadrennial. This matter is supported by the Farm Bureau, and by the Taxpayers' Federation. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer. This is also one of the most famous bills that's probably going to come up this year, because of its cosponsor. It is now officially a Dunn-Dunn bill. And we, of course, look forward to doing a -- doing a turkey over in the House, and making it a Dunn-Dunn-Dunn bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion on the Dunn-Dunn bill - Senate Bill 1211? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Dunn, to close.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

I urge an Ave vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senate Bill 1211. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1211 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that bill, there are 54 Aves, none voting No, none voting the this bill. having received required Present. and constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1212. Senator Mahar. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1212.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. The City of Chicago for a past number of years, has enjoyed a franchise with Commonwealth Edison. And this agreement agreement calculated based upon total revenues of the utility. We -- we believe that this amount realizes about seventy million dollars to the City of Chicago, and that is not in question. It was negotiated in good faith. However, what is in question, and what this bill seeks to correct, is the fact that the Commonwealth Edison seeks to recoup that seventy million dollars from its entire rate base, two-thirds of which is outside of the City of Chicago. If this bill passes, there will be about a forty-five million dollar end to that subsidy by suburban Cook and the Collar This bill would eliminate this situation by requiring that the franchise fee agreement be recouped from customers in the municipality which agreed to the franchise fee. I would be happy

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

to entertain any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further questions? Any further questions? Any further questions? Hearing none, Senator Mahar, to close. On this bill, Senate Bill 1212, the question is, shall this bill pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On this question, there are 43 Ayes, 9 voting No, 3 voting Present, and this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1223. Senate Bill 1228. Senator Cronin. Senate Bill 1253. Senator Carroll. Senate Bill 1260. Senator Hasara. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1260.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill is -- was introduced on behalf of about a hundred falconers in the State of Illinois. And as most of you know, falconers do not use a firearm when they hunt. And they have asked to be exempt from the orange hat legislation. They -- falconers do not hunt on public lands, because they don't like to hunt where other hunters are around. So they are only hunting on private land, and there are -- there are two problems that they have with wearing the orange hat. First of all, often their bird focuses on the color of the hat, and is a distraction in hunting. Secondly, falconers are concerned that when people see them

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

hunting on this land, that they think they are hunting illegally with a firearm and do not realize that they are simply out with their bird, hunting game and not even using a firearm. I have been asked to see that an amendment is put on in the House that would verify that they would be exempt only when other hunters are not available. And I will be glad to work on that. But it is true that they do not hunt when other hunters are around, because they are worried about their bird being shot. So I would be glad to answer any questions I -- that I can answer, and ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Just a moment, Senator Welch. Senator Welch would like to be heard in his question, and I'm sure Senator Hasara would like to know what the question is. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Hasara, in committee there was a question as to whether individuals with the birds would be wearing these orange hats. They would be in the field at the same time other hunters are out hunting. Have you remedied that, or have you changed the -- the -- the times of hunting so that they won't be out on the field at the same time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

As I mentioned, Senator, they do not hunt when other hunters are around. They do not hunt on public land, so I think the concern in the committee was about private lands, and as I just mentioned, I have agreed to work on an amendment in the House that

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

would specifically specify that they would be exempt only when no hunters are around. But as a matter of fact, they do not hunt when other hunters are around, because they're worried about their birds being shot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, if you have two hunters going out to two farms next to each other, and one tells the falconer he can go ahead and hunt, and the falconer doesn't have a hat on, and at the next farm they are out hunting pheasants and -- or deer, or both, and what's to stop somebody on the next farm from shooting at somebody without a hat. That's the whole purpose of wearing a hat is to protect the hunter, not -- not the falcon. So how can you avoid, unless you get all the farmers together in one area, to make sure they only have one type of hunter at a time out there? I -- that sounds to me like it's going to be very difficult to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

All I know is what the falconers tell me, Senator: that they obviously want to be very, very careful that they do not hunt when anyone else is around, for the safety of their birds. We will put an amendment on in the House that does specify that they are exempt only when there are no other hunters around.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, you know, this reminds me of the bill we had a few years ago, where -- it was -- we're going to give hunting licenses to blind people. It -- it makes as -- as little sense to me because you're going to have people -- so what if the falconers want to go

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

out there? We're going to authorize them to be in a field next to where people are hunting deer or other animals. The purpose here is to protect everybody. There's a hundred and thirty falconers that we're talking about. It -- it seems to me to be pretty ridiculous to exempt them from wearing a hat. I -- I think that's what this boils down to. They don't want to wear an orange hat -- seems to be what the problem is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are you finished?

SENATOR WELCH:

It makes no sense to me. I think we should vote No and let them come back and -- or let them wear their hats. That doesn't seem to be -- let them put a Cub sticker on the front, and they can wear them out in the field.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator Hawkinson, further discussion?

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. I shared some similar concerns; however, the sponsor has given her commitment and the Department has given a commitment to not move this bill in the House until we have an amendment that addresses the concerns of other hunters in the vicinity. And I agree with the prior speaker that that may be difficult to do. But we have the sponsor's commitment, and with that commitment, I'm prepared to advance this bill to the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

A question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

She indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Hasara, just correct me if I'm wrong. I think the

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

main idea that you are trying to impress upon the Members is that the reason that the caps don't want to be worn, is because they just want to make it very clear that they don't have weapons on them, and that their — their birds are actually — for less a meaning — unless I don't know, are — are their weapons, or whatever? And that's the only reason for this. It's not that they don't want to wear them, but they just want to make people aware that they're out in the field, and it's not that they don't want to comply with, it's just that they — they're unarmed and they just want to let their birds go free. Right? They caution the rest of the people that could be in the rest of the vicinity, not to shoot their bird.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

That's certainly correct, Senator. As I mentioned, there really are two concerns: what you expressed is one — that they don't want people to see the orange hat when they're on property where you're not supposed to be hunting with a firearm, and think they're doing something illegal. The second reason is that the hat is distracting to the bird. And often the bird will go for the hat, rather than for the game that they're hunting. I wish that you could meet some of these people. They are the most dedicated group of hunters I think that I've ever met. And they're very serious about their birds and what they're doing. And they're obviously very law-abiding. So you're exactly right. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill certainly appeared before our committee. Senator Hasara has done a pretty darn good job of trying to put this together to address

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

some concerns that the falconers have. This isn't -- like five thousand people out there, for heaven's sakes. It's a small group of people that want some kind of exemption from the orange cap bill. We did that for the field trialers - the bird dog field trialers last year, when this bill passed. And I don't think it's-- it's, quite frankly, that big a deal. These little falcons don't chase after Senator Madigan's rotating pigeons, or somersaulting pigeons, or anything. For the most part, they're out there in the field hunting little mice, and -- and if they want this exemption, for heaven's sakes, why shouldn't we pass it? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I -- I think this bill will weaken my orange cap bill that we had last year. You know, we passed that for safety reasons, and you know, I -- I just think that these people shouldn't be out there when they're -- when they're hunting. If they do, you know, I'd think they'd have these falcons trained enough that the red cap wouldn't -- I mean the orange cap wouldn't confuse them on whether it's the falcon hunter, or whether it's -- it's the regular hunter. I -- I think this is just something else to clutter up the law with and weaken my bill, and I -- I would oppose this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. Well, a question of Senator Woodyard. Senator Woodyard says that these birds prey on mice. How in God's name are the mice going to see them if they don't have orange caps on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I guess Tom hit the nail pretty much on the head. You know, we have been bragging all this Session, and it is exemplified this Session that we truly have been taking care of bills that are emergencies, and probably the Governor will not see probably more than a hundred bills, outside of -- outside of appropriations, to sign. And I -- I do realize how important this is, and this has to be one of the greater emergencies in the State of Illinois for there -- this bill to get out of Rules, so I think we should get to a vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any -- any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Hasara, to close.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Madam President. I think the issues have been well discussed. Again, we're talking about a very dedicated group of a little over a hundred falconers who have two concerns: one is that people will think they're hunting illegally when they're not. And secondly, that their birds have targeted on the hat, and not the game that they are hunting. The mice are not supposed to see the bird, and I just -- I think it's a -- a valid exemption, and I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1260 pass. Those in favor, 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 wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay, 3 voting Present, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Welch, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WELCH:

12.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Well, I don't have an orange hat on, so you probably couldn't see me but, I -- I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I don't think anybody would fail to see you, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I would like to verify this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Or hear you. Go ahead, sir.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch is asking for a verified roll call. We're calling to the Floor, everyone. Request for a verification, by Senator Welch. Will all Senators be -- Senators be in their seats? The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY HARRY:

The following voted in the affirmative: Burzynski, Butler, DeAngelis, Dillard, Donahue, Dudycz, Ralph Dunn, Fawell, Fitzgerald, Geo-Karis, Hasara, Hawkinson, Karpiel, Klemm, Lauzen, Madigan, Mahar, Maitland, O'Malley, Peterson, Petka, Raica, Rauschenberger, Sieben, Syverson, Topinka, Watson, Weaver, Woodyard and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Mr. Welch, do you question the presence of any Member? SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. Senator Donahue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Donahue? She's right in the back.

SENATOR WELCH:

I see her now. Senator Mahar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar is in his seat.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Syverson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Syverson is right in front of me.

SENATOR WELCH:

I guess that's it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Then on the verified roll call, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 23, Present are 3, and this vote <sic> (bill), having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate -- Senate Bill 1274. Senator Watson. Senator Watson, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I would.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1274 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Watson. Senator -- Secretary, on the Order of 2nd Bill -- Reading is Senate Bill 1274. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senators Watson, O'Malley and Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Senate Amendment No. 1 creates the Chicago Learning Zone Commission, and addresses the issue of the Chicago Learning Zone. We established a committee last Session and the committee came back and this is their

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

recommendation. It creates the Commission to review petitions for Learning Zone status, approve petitions and report any statutory waivers requested in the petition. Establishes a seventeen-member Commission and spells out the means by which they will be appointed. It establishes the criteria for becoming a Learning Zone school. Establishes some limitations. There are some non-waivable mandates that are also -- cannot be exempted. The Commission will report on the waivers, and it becomes effective immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon has the Floor.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Watson, this -- this Commission: what would be the makeup of the Commission, and who would select the commissioners?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. The Commission would be -- would consist of seventeen members. The Governor, the State Superintendent, the President of the Chicago School Board, the Mayor of Chicago, nine gubernatorial appointees, with the consent of the Senate, two from the CTU, two from the Chicago school unions -- other unions, one Chicago principal, two from the local school councils, and two from community organizations. And then one member each appointed by the four Legislative Leaders.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Okay, now this is for Chicago Public Schools alone, not -- no other district. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

That is correct. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Can you explain to me why the Mayor of the City of Chicago does not have any appointees to this board, and the Governor has nine? Did you say nine? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

There are nine gubernatorial appointees. That's correct - with the advice and consent of the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Can you explain to me, if this is the City of Chicago, why the Mayor of the City of Chicago, with the consent of the Chicago City Council, does not have any appointees?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, this is the exact makeup of the advisory committee that we passed last year. As far as the Mayor's concerned, no, there's no rationale or no necessary reason why he's being exempted from appointments, but he's got one -- one sitting member that comes right out of his office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Well, I voted against it last year, and I'm going to vote against it again today. And I think that -- that it is appalling to me, to have this Commission in the first place, which is really just a prelude - and everybody should be clear about it - for vouchers in the City of Chicago. Because you're simply stacking the deck with people who do not care anything at all about the -the children in the Chicago public schools. What you're doing is setting up this -- this quote, unquote, Learning Zone, and going to stack the -- the -- the deck with people who have nothing to do, and no concern whatsoever, about the children learning, as long as they're part of the Chicago public school system. And my question to you is: How can you say that it is fair at all to -to leave the Mayor of the City of Chicago out? And my other question to you is: who will determine where this zone will be -how many schools will be involved in the zone, and will -- will the boundaries of the zone be contiguous?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

First of all, the Commission will make that determination as to where the zone boundaries may reside. The -- one thing to remember now, Senator, is the -- the Mayor has -- an appointment, and then the other nine gubernatorial appointments come from within the City, they're -- Chicago Teachers Union has two, the other unions have two, a Chicago principal and two from the local school councils, and two from community organizations. So these are -- this is, I'd say, a well-representative group of the -- of the City of Chicago and the educational concerns of -- of the entire education community.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

And I -- I'm going to respectfully request some -- some -some quiet in this Chamber, because this is very important to the future of the -- of the City of Chicago and Chicago public Now, my -- my question to you: Is there any criteria to determine which schools -- is there any criteria in your bill that will guide the Commission in determining which schools will be in this Learning Zone? And secondly, is there any criteria in your -- your bill that will make sure that the -- the -- the appointees to the zone will represent the -- the wholeness and completeness, racially, ethnically and -- and geographically of the City of Chicago. Because, I -- I tell you, my friend, there -- there -it is -- it is clear to me that you can easily find a principal who believes in -- in -- in destroying the Chicago public schools because they believe in -- in vouchers. And you can also find some local school council members, and I'm certain you can find appointees of the Governor -- just because they live in Chicago doesn't mean that they are in favor of Chicago public schools. So is there any criteria, number one, to the selection process of the schools that are going to be in this zone? And is there anything in your bill that will make sure that all races, nationalities, geographical area is represented on this Commission? And thirdly, how much is this going to cost the people of the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay. The answer is yes, there is criteria by which the Learning Zone schools would be established. And I would -- I will give you that criteria, Senator. There needs to be -- the application needs to demonstrate that there's improved student

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

learning will result from the Learning Zone. The -- the proposed adoption of high rigorous standards of achievement and outcome for all students and staff. There's a proposed use of shared decision-making process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon, I can't blame you very well, but your extents of the questioning, of course, has some of the people waiting to be heard. Please be quiet for Senator Hendon's queries, and for Senator Watson's responses. Thank you.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, there's substantial criteria by which these zones would be established, Senator, and I could go through that if you like. Okay. I've given you three items -- you didn't hear The criteria for the Learning Zone must right. Okav. All demonstrate that improved student learning will result. If -- the proposed adoption of high rigorous standards of achievement and outcome for all students and staff. Proposed use of shared decision-making. Creative, flexible and innovative proposals of restructuring. and community involvement. Parental Development of collaborative relationships with health and and localized efforts. agencies. Decentralization Appropriation -- or appropriateness of budget and resource There's quite a lengthy list of criteria by which allocations. the Commission would establish a -- a Learning Zone, and I feel comfortable with that list. And I think if you read the -- the bill - and if you haven't, I would suggest that you do - you would agree that there's -- there's substantial criteria here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon, are you done?

SENATOR HENDON:

In conclusion -- in conclusion, first of all, you're just introducing this amendment today. I haven't see it, and I would

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

appreciate a copy, so that I can read it. Because unless you -you give it to me, then -- then -- then I don't have it. That's first of all. Secondly, how can a person prove that there's going to be an improvement in the learning process? You have to wait and test the students afterwards. You can't prove beforehand that is going to be successful. In conclusion, let me just something say that this is a bad bill. It -- it is a -- a continuation of this same old song, and it's amazing to me that for the first time, seemed like in this entire Session, we have something of substance, and it is negative. We've been talking about birds and -- and mice and little red -- or orange hats and whatever. We've been talking about a lot of things that -- that really have been meaningless, this entire Session, and now we have something that is -- is substantive, and it is negative, and it is slanted, and I urge a No vote on this very, very terrible bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson, did you have a response?

SENATOR WATSON:

Oh, I don't think there's any...(microphone cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Berman. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Point of order. Senator Collins, what's your point of order?

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Madam President, this -- were you going to deal with that? I'll yield to Senator Berman, if he's going to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I thank you very kindly, Senator Collins. Senator Berman, she has yielded to you.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill -- this bill -- the amendment is the product of a Commission that met over a number of months. However, the amendment just was considered maybe two hours ago, in the Education Committee, and many of our Members have not had a chance to read the amendment, or see the analysis. So I would respectfully ask if the sponsor -- if he could hold -- not move this on 2nd Reading, consider it perhaps tomorrow, after our Members have had a chance to review it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. I will -- I will do that. But I would like to say one thing, that Senator Hendon, the amendment is on your desk. Well, it's been there; it was distributed for quite some time. It's been there, you've had ample opportunity to look it over and read it. I will take it out of the record. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We'll not have arguments here, now. It's -- it's out of the record. It's out of the record. Next bill. 1296. Senator Mahar. Mr. Secretary, will you please read 1296.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1296.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar, on Senate Bill 1296.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President and Members. Last year we passed Senate Bill 41 by a vote of 54 to nothing. This is clean-up language requested by the Illinois Bankers Association. The bill passed last year established a Phase I Environmental Audit as a

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

standard of due diligence, or all appropriate inquiry for corporations, developers, et cetera, to satisfy innocent landowner defense under the EPA Super Fund Provisions. The audit must include a recorded chain of title of document search, which was a length of seventy-five years. The IBA is -- is saying that that has been unworkable. They are recommending in this -- this bill that that be a measure of fifty years. There was no opposition in committee, nor have I heard of any since, and I would ask for a positive roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

further discussions? Any further discussions? Any further discussions? Hearing none, Senator Mahar, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1296 be passed. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The record is 57 Ayes -- have you taken the record, Mr. Clerk -- Mr. Secretary? The record is taken. 57 Ayes, voting No, none voting Present. And the bill -- this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared Senate Bill 1299. Senator O'Malley. Senate Bill 1323. Senate -- Senate Bill 1324. Senator Watson. Senator Watson. Senator DeAngelis. Senate Bill 1336. Senator DeAngelis. Senate Bill 1339. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senate Bill 1339.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1339.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 1339, as amended,

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

creates the Automobile Leasing Occupation and Use Tax. This puts leases over one year on cars, recreational vehicles and vans in the same category as they would be if they were leased in less than one year. The only difference is that — the village portion — municipal portion — is still on this. The rate is 6.25 percent. Currently under law, when you lease a vehicle you pay the full sales tax up front, regardless for how long you lease it, provided that it's longer than a year. At the time the car is then resold, the tax is applied again. This bill brings a little more equity, puts us competitive with states surrounding us, and also makes it a little easier on the pocketbook when you're trying to lease a car. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussions? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is -- the question is, Senate Bill -- shall Senate Bill 1339 pass. Those in favor will vote Ave. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. the record. On that question, there are 56 <sic> (58) Yeas, none voting No, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1344. Senate Bill 1352. Senator Sieben. Dillard. Senate Bill 1357. Senator Hawkinson. Senate Bill 1358. Senator Hawkinson. Senate Bill 1366. Senator O'Malley. Senate Bill 1381. Senator Klemm. Senate Bill 1421. Senator Fitzgerald. Senator Peterson. Senate Bill 1447. Senator Senate Bill 1435. Senate Bill 1456. Senator Barkhausen. Senate Bill 1473. Senate Bill 1476. Senator Butler. Senator Syverson. Syverson. Senate Bill 1479. Senator Madigan. Senator Senator Farley. Bill 1491. 1491. Senator Farley. Senate Bill 1491. Senator Farley. Senator Farley, are you -wish to proceed on...? Senate Bill 1509. Senator Maitland. Senate Bill 1510. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, read the

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

bill. It's Senate Bill 1510.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1510.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 1510 allows park districts and forest preserve district non-referendum bonds to be added to the definition of "aggregate extension." When we passed the tax cap law, inadvertently it was -- inadvertently, what we did is we left out these bonds as part of the aggregate extension, according to the interpretation of some of your bond counsels. This bill does not - and I might state it again - does not permit a district to exceed the cap limit. What it does do: It allows them to include their non-referendum bonds as part of -- out of their aggregate extension. Be very happy to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are you finished? Any further discussion? Senator Palmer. SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a comment on this bill. I'm certainly going to vote for it for my dear colleague, Senator DeAngelis. However, I want to point out, once again, that here we are giving relief for tax caps, which were ill-considered in the first place. If we had thought ahead of time, and if we had had the time to review, then we might not have had - as I did last year - two pages of single-spaced exceptions to the tax cap. And this is one again, and I suspect it's not the last of them. Just a remark and just a reminder.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. I may have a conflict in this, and I intend to vote my conscience.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1510 pass. You wish to close? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah. Just for the record, I want to remind the Body that this bill does not permit - does not permit - a levy in excess of the cap.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1510 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 11 Nays, 4 voting Present. This bill, having received the -- the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Reports, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: referred to the Appropriations Committee - Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1258; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1754; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1756; Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1758; Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1759; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1760; Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1761; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1763; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1764; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1765; Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1769; Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1770; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1771; Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1772;

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1773; Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill and Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1775; to the Committee on Education - Amendment 1 to Senate Bill Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1323: and Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1324; plus Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1716; to the Committee on Environment and Energy - Amendment 4 to Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1649; and Amendment 3 to Senate Bill to the Executive Committee - Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1724; to the Committee on Financial Institutions - Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1229; to the Committee on Insurance, Pensions Licensed Activities - Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1421; Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1435; Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1479; Amendment 1 Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1706; and to Senate Bill 1624: Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1728; to the Judiciary Committee -Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1352; to the Committee on Local Government and Elections - Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1263; and Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1491; to the Committee on Revenue Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1336; Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 to Senate Bill State Government Operations to the Committee on and Executive Appointments - Amendment 6, Senate Bill 1715; to the Transportation Committee - Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1200; Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1819; and Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1691, and Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1702.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Anything further there? Now, back to 3rd Reading, page 5. We start with Senate Bill 1513. Senator Petka. Mr. Secretary, will you read Senate Bill 1513.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1513.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1513 would allow a court to impose drug testing as a condition of bail on felony drug possession or delivery offenses. The -- under the terms of this legislation, a person to be admitted to recognizance or I-bond could be required as a condition of the recognizance bond to consent to drug testing. If the defendant chooses not to participate in such a program, then the -- the court can set a normal bond as opposed to recognizance bond. The reason for the legislation is very simple. A disproportionally high number of offenders unfortunately are drug addicts, and this permits the court at a very -- very early stage to intervene in a possible rehabilitation of the individuals. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HALL:

Senator, I -- I'm trying to get this for information only. It says here this legislation may be partially unconstitutional, because a defendant who wishes to be set free for a recognizance bond must be tested for drugs. Is that correct? That's not right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR PETKA:

Under this legislation, a person can be admitted to a recognizance bond; however, where there's a request made, pursuant to a -- or -- or if the court requests, pursuant to a motion that the person take a drug test, then a person does not -- is not entitled to a I-bond, but in that instance, the court will ask for a normal bail to be set.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Madam President. Question to the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Senator, if -- if I have it right, and I just heard your explanation, but it's still unclear to me. So if -- if you have these defendants parading in front of a judge for a bond hearing, and judges giving an I-bond or the defendant or his public defender or the attorney requests or states that an I-bond would be appropriate, that this legislation states that the only way that this defendant can get an I-bond would be for him to submit to a drug test. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

In felony prosecutions involving drug delivery or possession of a controlled substance or cannabis, Senator, the person can only get an I-bond if he submits to a drug test, were it requested to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

As I read the legislation - and I could be wrong - I think it says that all felonies, any felony, whether drug-related or not...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator...

SENATOR MOLARO:

...you would have to submit to a drug test.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

My staffers point out that you are correct. That's correct to -- to be eligible for a recognizance bond; otherwise normal
bail-setting procedures would be followed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

So then we have it where even if there are -- even if you have a drug arrest that's a misdemeanor, to get an I-bond he would have to. And even if you have an unrelated felony, whether it's -- say it's theft over three hundred dollars, or theft whatever the amount is, to get an I-bond, you would then have to submit to a drug test. Which leads to a couple of things. I mean, not only is it difficult in the sense that the charge doesn't relate to drugs. The second thing is, we have a problem in a sense of self-incrimination, because I don't know -- is that drug test then just limited to that bond proceeding? I mean, it would certainly put in the mind of a prosecutor or State's attorney to, you know, take the charge further than what it should be. So, on those two counts, that self-incrimination, as well as making a person submit to a drug test when he's charged with theft - you know, I -- I -- I think we're pushing it too far.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Petka, to close.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you again, Madam President. I'd like just to clarify a few things. First of all, Senator Molaro, this will apply only in those jurisdictions where the chief judge establishes the program, where the county board approves, and the probation department or pretrial service agency agrees to administer such a program. If in fact, there is no agreement of -- of any of the agencies or the chief judge that I just referred to, then these provisions will not be triggered. But to direct the answer to your question in -of -- of whether or not we are dealing with in terms self-incrimination, as you well know, California versus Schmerber holds that certain types of physical evidence do not - and seizure of such - do not apply -- or simply, the self-incrimination privilege does not apply. Ιt deals with testimonial incrimination. So it simply is -- is not a part of -- of legislation. So I would urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1513 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, there are 46 Ayes, 4 Nays, 5 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1516. Thomas Dunn. Senate Bill 1522. Senator Watson. Did you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading, Senator Watson?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I do, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senate Bill 1522 is returned to the Order of 2nd Reading,

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

unless there is any objection. Hearing no objection, on the Order of 2nd -- 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1522. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This amendment provides that the AFDC parent has a right to choose what type of adult-supervised arrangement they wish. And it also changes the age limitation from eighteen to under the age of seventeen. And it also further clarifies that — that there is good cause, the Department of Public Aid may waive the requirements of this particular Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The amendment is carried. And -- any further amendments, Madam Secretary?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments approved for consideration, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1523. Senator Burzynski. Madam Secretary, will you read Senate Bill 1523.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1523.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. 1523 corrects a provision I think that was wrongly enacted in 1990, which requires the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Corrections to enter into an agreement providing for the expeditious processing of welfare applications by persons released from State prisons. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Thank you. Senator, what is the rationale? Why do you want to slow down this process that we have now going?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Actually, I -- I don't want to slow down the process. But what I think that we're doing is basically trying to ensure, or -- or take a look at this and -- and -- and try and break that welfare cycle. What we're doing, we're encouraging people who are in prison to go ahead to complete the process, and we're not only encouraging them to do that, we're helping them to do that, so that they can receive an expedited public aid payment within ten days of their release from prison. I think that's penalizing people that are outside of the correctional system who need some assistance as well. And we're not providing them with that expeditious process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. When we passed this great piece of legislation a few years ago, what we were looking at was essentially trying to

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

ensure that those people who have been incarcerated, when they come out that they would have this safety net. So hopefully that they would not go back to and hanging out with their -- their bad friends and get involved in some cases - in a lot of cases - by hanging around in those drug communities, and this will help them by being able to have some kind of support - financial support - allow them again to become further, or at least faster, on their way to become better citizens. By slowing down this process by eliminating this expediting, seemingly it's working in contrary, or conflict, with that -- that whole notion that they should get this second chance, and then get as -- as much help as possible to ensure that they can become productive citizens. I guess the question being is -- is...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzvnski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I appreciate your concerns. I would point out, though, that there's nothing in the language that would preclude an inmate from applying for public aid before they're released. This just says we're not going to expedite that process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Since there is nothing in the language that says that it won't preclude them from applying, then I just think that this is a piece of legislation that we do not need to be addressing at this time. The system is working as it is, and to do away with something that's working is — goes back to the whole notion: why fix it if it's not broken? I believe that this is a bad bill and a bad idea, and we all should vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Fawell.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Will the sponsor yield for a question? Senator, do we have General Assistance any more, and wouldn't these prisoners fall underneath General Assistance, if indeed they were eligible?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It's my understanding that we really don't have a State-funded General Assistance program at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So what kind of public aid are they eligible for, unless it's the women who have children that are coming out of prison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

They would be eligible for AFDC payments if... If they're eligible for anything, it's probably AFDC payments, although there would be some transitional assistance for those who are able to work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator, are you aware of the fact that there is a -- a commission working on -- on exactly this problem? Are you aware of the fact that right now, when we dismiss these men from prison, what we give them is carfare to get home and fifty bucks to live on until such time as they supposably get settled? And unfortunately, what we are finding is that these men, if they are released from prison without any support system behind them, quite

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

frequently turn around and hit somebody else over the head and go back into prison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I wasn't aware of the commission that you're in reference to. But I guess I would suggest that, once again, what we're doing is, we're continuing that -- that reliance on the welfare cycle. And in this year when we talked about welfare reform and trying to change the process that we've been going through, I think it's appropriate that we try and address this bill, at this time. And certainly, I would hope that when people are released from a correctional facility, that they would be able to - on their own ability - apply for such assistance as necessary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hall. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

You're...

SENATOR HALL:

... Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

You're standing in front of Senator Hall. Would you mind removing yourself?

SENATOR HALL:

Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

END OF TAPE

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

TAPE 2

SENATOR HALL:

Senators, number one, I'd like to know, who are the Christian Coalitions? Who are they?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I'm not sure I heard your question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Would you repeat your question, Senator Hall?

SENATOR HALL:

Would you please tell us who the Christian Coalition is? They're the proponents of the bill, I see.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Mr. -- Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I'm not exactly sure what you're in reference to, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

...(microphone cutoff)...I ask that...I'll go to the second question. It says the opponents of this is the Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago, the Legislative Service Center, and this will prevent reunification of families. Are you aware of that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I was aware that the Legal Assistance Foundation was opposed to the bill, as well. I would argue whether or not it prevents the reunification of families, though.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

That's all right. I just wanted to get that information.

- PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Topinka, further discussion.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate - and I think we had some discussion on this in committee - simply put, all this does is just put those folks who are leaving jail in the same line as any others who would be seeking public assistance. All this does is not put them at the head of the line so that indeed they get a special privilege from coming out of prison, as opposed to those others who may be just as needy and seeking public assistance. And it kind of puts things, I think, into an equilibrium that's quite understandable, very practical, and tending toward common sense. So I would stand in support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator del Valle, for further discussion? Senator del Valle. SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. The staff analysis I have indicates that the provision which is being repealed by Senate Bill 1523 affects mainly prisoners who are women with dependent children. Now, Senator, do you know how many of those dependent children are wards of the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

No, we don't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator del Valle.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

So we really don't know how -- how many of those children would be returned to the natural parent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

No, I don't have that information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR del VALLE:

Well, I think it is -- to the bill, Madam Chair: I think it is important to have answers to those kinds of questions, because certainly we've seen in the news lately how many children are being taken by DCFS because of the conditions that they're being living under - bare apartments without food and refrigerators, et cetera. And what we're saying here is that we are going to have an individual, who has been released from prison, who does not have a guaranteed place to live in when they're released on the day that they're released, that those individuals should wait in line along with everyone else. means that the kids that are waiting to be reunited with the mother also have to wait. I thought that the original intent of this was to make sure that there is at least a place to go to live at when you walk out of those prison doors. And so I really don't understand why we're going backwards, particularly given the growing number of cases that we have in DCFS and the cost of those cases to the taxpayers in the State of Illinois. Seems to me that this is a provision that allows us to save money, rather than increase the cost to the State. So I would urge a No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: I do not understand the purpose of this bill. The -- obviously, if these are people who are being released from prison, it says, by virtue of that act, that the court system has finished with them. They have served their time. They have done so in a way that allows them to be dismissed from the prison. Everything that we have ever done in the history of this country has said to us that at that moment, it is time now to try to work against recidivism and to make sure that those who are released have the proper supports so that they might not return to the system, and therefore put an added burden taxpayer. When you are speaking specifically about women with children, I think this is a punishment, and I cannot understand the purpose for it. It's not a question of putting them in line ahead of anyone else. This bill does not preclude them from applying. All it seems to do is to be a little nit-picking and say, "Well, listen guys, you can't apply for this while you are being released. You have to wait until you get out." So that your children are now put in even more jeopardy, and as Senator del Valle pointed out, are therefore perhaps in a position of being hurt even further by a system that will cost us even more. So in the final analysis, it's not even logical to do this, and I would suggest that we vote No on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We have four more speakers. Senator Watson, for further discussion. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I -- I understand what the opponents are saying, but I don't believe what this bill does is what they're saying. What they -- an individual who is incarcerated can apply for Public Aid benefits prior to leaving prison. It defies common sense to me, why we should allow for

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

somebody who is incarcerated to go to the front of the line, because that's exactly what's being done now. They get expedited processing by the Department of Public Aid. All we're saying is, whenever they apply, they should get in line like everybody else. You know, sometimes we got to teach people responsibility, and that's part of the problem in this country, is people aren't willing to accept the responsibility for their actions. And this — all this is doing is saying — is that you're just like everybody else. You've got to file an application and be approved just like everybody else. Nothing is expedited. You are treated just like everybody else. And for us to think that somebody that's incarcerated ought to have a benefit, that defies common sense. The proper vote on this is Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Collins. Senator Collins. SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Madam President. I guess there's really no need for me to say anything, because I think Senator Palmer said it all, and I guess it's just -- it's amazing that you don't really They're not just like everybody else. The people who understand. are outside are more likely to already have a place to stay or kind of community linkage. The person who has been incarcerated five or ten, fifteen years, have to come back into the community. First of all, to get a place to stay, you need a deposit. You have to have some money and some linkage in order to come home. Now, do you want to keep them in prison until such time that they find some kind of way to get the money or stand in line? Where they -- what line are they going to stand in? people are going to come out and they are going to eat. Now, they can sleep with the homeless, maybe, but nine times out of ten these people are going to end right back up into prison. why it makes sense. Actually, it makes even more sense. We had a

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

bill that said before - when it is definite that a time certain is set for someone to be released from prison, that the Department of Public Aid, and especially those with children, should be making provisions so that when they walk out of that door, they have a head start on trying to become integrated and linked back into the community. That makes common sense. What you're talking about over there, what you can't understand it -- I don't understand when you say you don't see; they're just like everybody else. They're not just like everybody else, but we're trying to make them like everybody else by giving them a head start so that they get back out there and support their families and be responsible citizens. I think this is a bad idea, and it's something that you really shouldn't be doing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Garcia, for further discussion?

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Senator, it sounds like some of the previous speakers think that this bill will help us get tough on crime. I was wondering if during the time since the question was asked, whether, in fact, the majority of individuals affected by this would be women with dependent children, whether you've had the opportunity to consult with staff and to find out if, in fact, that is the case.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It -- I guess I would suggest that most would be males who would be eligible for AFDC; however, obviously your staff has a different analysis of that.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

So your contention is that the majority of people affected by this are, in fact, males who are being released from prison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It -- it could be people that are eligible for transitional assistance, but it does affect the general population of the prison system.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Well, it is our contention, our staffers, that the majority of people that we will be affecting by this are not criminals that are being released, but rather women who have had problems with the law, and most importantly, children that are seeking to be reunited with those mothers. To label this as a bill that is going to get tough on crime and criminals is simply misleading, and I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Burzynski, how many women are released a month from the Department of Corrections?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I -- I really have no idea, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

So you really have no idea how many women with children this bill will affect. Is that not true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Let me point out something. We do have one State correctional facility that is a women's prison. I would also point out that we're not denying them the right to apply or pre-apply. We're just saying we're not going to walk them through the process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

I -- I asked you, in all due respect, did you -- did you know the number of women that were going to be affected, and if you don't, just say you don't, and then we can -- we can debate the other parts of your bill. But I just asked you, do you know -- can you put a figure on it so that we will know how many of these families will be further in the DCFS system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator Hendon, had you been listening to earlier questions and answers, you would have the answer to that question. I indicated that I was unsure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR HENDON:

I don't know how you can determine whether I was listening or not, but I tell you, I was. And it was clear to me that you have evaded answering that question, simply because you know that it is embarrassing to you to give an answer to that question, because the answer is, you don't know. So you cannot really give an answer, so you want to be evasive. I have another question for you, and maybe you won't be quite as evasive on this one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon, confine your remarks to the subject at hand, without any extraneous...

SENATOR HENDON:

I respect that, Madam President, but I am going to respond...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

...without any extraneous editorialism. Thank you.

SENATOR HENDON:

I am going to respond if he says I'm not sitting here listening. I think that that is a disgrace to the people who sent me here, if I'm sitting here not listening. And I am paying attention. I want him to know that I was. And I respect the Chair. Your bill, Senator, will extend this — this opportunity for them to get back on their feet. Do you believe that your bill will increase incarceration or decrease incarceration — the return to — to prison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I'm not sure that your question has anything to do with the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

If -- first of all, a person coming out of prison is disadvantage. Secondly, I want you to be clear where I'm coming from. I don't believe everybody in jail is quilty. That's first of all. I do not believe -- they may have been found guilty, but they are not all guilty. That's first of all. Secondly, they are not on equal ground -- footing, as far as getting a doi getting back on their feet, as someone who's just out here loafing around or whatever or just happens to need welfare for whatever reason. Because they are coming out of jail. And when you apply for a job, then the employer is going to ask them, what have they been doing the last three or four years, and they're going to be saying, "I've been in jail." So, if you take -- if you -- the purpose of this legislation, this fine piece of legislation, was to close that gap of giving them something coming in their pockets so they won't be sitting around two months without anything coming in at all. And I believe that if they're sitting around without anything coming in at all for a longer period of time, then the possibilities of them going back into jail and the taxpayers of the State of Illinois picking up that twenty thousand dollars a year for that person is greatly increased. So, what your bill and your cosponsor, Senator Watson's bill, actually does is put a higher burden on the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. So my question to you is: Is it easier for a what it does. person coming out of jail to get a job as it is for a person who is not coming out of jail?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, I would guess that there are several answers to that question. I guess that also depends on what a person has done while he's been incarcerated to prepare himself for release, and that's the deeper question. And if a person has not prepared

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

himself enough upon his release to know how to access the system, then I would suggest that they need to be doing that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon, are you ready?

SENATOR HENDON:

... (microphone cutoff)... conclusion -- in conclusion, I'11 There's a real world, and there's the world that some of you seem to want to paint for yourself. In the real world, my friend, whatever you did in jail, when you come out, you're coming out with that burden of being incarcerated riding on your back. Whether you were innocent or quilty, that burden is there. matter what the crime is, that burden is there. Now to make it harder for that person to get back on their feet is just almost guaranteeing that they are going to go back into prison and that this State -- the taxpayers of this State are going to have to pay twenty thousand dollars a year for that person again in jail. my friend, let me remind you that there is a great waiting list of people in prison right now trying to get to some of those We've had Director Peterson <sic> testify that there programs. are not enough programs for the people in jail right now to themselves together. So this bill -- what you will do, my friend, just to make sure that we -- that they go right back in jail and make sure that the taxpayers of this State have to pay that twenty thousand dollars a year, while you can go out and campaign that you were tough on crime, so la-di-da, la-di-di. This is bad bill, and I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Topinka, further discussion? A second time. SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Madam President, I call the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

discussion? Senator Burzynski, to close.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. I think there seems to be a great misconception of what this bill does and what it doesn't do, what its intent is. I've not labeled this as a tough-on-crime bill. Others have. That's not the intent. The intent is to level the playing field, to make sure that people have equal opportunities under the law, and that we are not giving special treatment to those that are undeserving, as well. I would encourage an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1523 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Had all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 Ayes, 16 Nays, 1 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1524. Senator Burzynski. 1525. Senator Watson?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1525.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This particular piece of legislation provides that a AFD <sic> assistant <sic> (assistance) unit, which would be an individual enrolled in AFDC, may not receive, on the account of a birth of an additional child, additional benefits. The -- this is -- similar legislation passed

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

in New Jersey, Wisconsin and California. The effective date of this bill is September 1st of 1995. And what we're asking the Department of Public Aid to do is, with the money that they're saving, which -- it's eight to ten million dollars is what we understand, that the money be used to impact training and education, day care and transportation needs of those people who are -- are enrolled in AFDC. This -- I want to make it perfectly clear that this particular piece of legislation does not impact the family receiving food stamps or medical assistance for those What we're saying here is that if you are additional children. enrolled in AFDC and you can come in and you can be enrolled and however many children you have - there is a limit, I believe, currently - but you can be enrolled in AFDC, and -- and while you are enrolled, after you become enrolled, then if you have an additional child, we're saying that your grant does not go up because of the birth of that additional child. Be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Watson, you have carried so many of these bills recently, I'm just curious. How many women on AFDC are in your district?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I really have no idea, but you'd probably be surprised.

I mean, we have a lot of poverty problem in the rural areas, and

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

-- which, of course, I come from a rural district. So if you're insinuating that I come from a wealthy area of the State, you're -- you're quite wrong.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Oh, not at all, Senator Watson. I wasn't implying anything. I was just curious, because most of us carry one of two types of legislation: either that that speaks directly to the needs of our district, or those that we want to impact upon the State as a whole. So since you do not know how many women there are on public aid in your district, I have to assume the latter, in which case I would have serious questions about the purpose of such a bill. And let me ask you one other question. Since this seems to be saying that this money will be used for job development and so forth - which I certainly applaud - do you have a companion bill to this that provides a job for job creation, since I think every evidence shows that we do not have enough jobs available? Is there a -- now a transfer point by which the people who are trained will actually have a job at the completion of this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, as far as companion legislation, Senator, no, but we do spell out in the Act that our intention is that any savings that's derived from this should go to those types of programs - job service, job-related, education-related - in helps <sic> of helping break the chain of dependency on public aid or welfare, as we now know it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Palmer.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. To the bill: Let's vote No on this. Once again, we have a punitive measure that is disguised as some way of punishing people who happen to be on AFDC. I think the statistics show that women on AFDC have on average two children, so I don't think that we need to be concerned that the hordes are coming to overcome us. Let's vote No on a bill that doesn't take us anywhere except to put women and children in a jeopardizing position again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Watson, are you pro-life or pro-choice?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

That's not addressed in this legislation, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

It's addressed in my question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Oh, I'm -- pro-life and I'm proud of it, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR HENDON:

I thought you were pro-life; that's what confuses me about this piece of legislation. When this bill came up last year, we discussed this, and I -- and I -- and I really don't understand my Republican friends on -- on this particular bill, especially those that are pro-life, because this bill is a -- a terrible bill when it comes to children. You're saying to people, "Don't have children." You're saying, "Have abortions. Get rid of them." You're saying, "If you happen to get pregnant, for whatever reason" - and people can practice prevention and still end up pregnant - you're saying, "Well, hey, tough." So it -- it doesn't seem like you're pro-life to me. And I really don't understand this, coming from my -- my -- my Republican friends who I know are sincerely pro-life - and sincerely pro-life, and mean well with your position. This goes counter to that. Now, our analysis says that this bill is going to force more children into poverty. What is your response to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I'm sorry. I wasn't listening, and I guess I missed the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

See, Senator Burzynski, that's who wasn't listening. It wasn't me; it was Senator Watson. Senator, I'm saying to you that our analysis says that this bill is going to force more children into poverty. I'd like your response to that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Well, I have no intention of doing that, Senator. That's not the intent of this bill. It's -- the intent of this legislation is to -- to make people be responsible for their actions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President, and I appreciate your indulgence with me, especially since I've been quiet this entire Session. I don't intend to be quiet the rest of it. So you can get -- get -- get ready for that, because today we have some substantive matters before us, and this is one of them. Now, I have one other question that was asked earlier, and I want to ask it of you, Senator Watson. Who is the Eagle Forum and the Christian Coalition?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I would assume that they're two organizations that are here in this State or have -- have -- are lobby groups that probably registered with the Secretary of State. And I imagine if you would contact them, you would be able to find out how to get in touch with them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

And that -- that is all you can tell us about them? You -- you don't know nothing? You just have to assume who they are? You really don't know? If you don't -- I'll -- I'll conclude by saying that, once again, I guess today is "Bad Bill Day" and here comes another one, and I am appalled that my friends who are pro-life would be sponsoring and vote for this -- this pro-death bill, because that's what it is. It's death for the children;

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

it's death for people in poverty. It's going to force more people in poverty, more people in the AFDC, more children into that, more children in DCFS and more -- more people into prison. This is a bad bill, and we should vote No on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President. I'm trying to figure out how to say this tactfully, because there's probably no real good way say it tactfully. But when Members from one side of the aisle start pointing Members at the other side of the aisle, as far pro-life and pro-choice go -- you know, Senator Watson and Senator -- Senator Burzynski had an idea or a concept for a piece of legislation. They put it into the General Assembly, and it's here to be voted on before the Members, whether it be a Republican or whether it be a Democrat. This was a concept that has been in the General Assembly at least the eight years that I've been here. A lot of the Members feel that there are certain constituents or certain populations, certain people within the State of Illinois that feel - and it has been, because it's been in different studies - that just having children, or amount of children, there's ways that they have of getting additional funding for their family. This has nothing to do with food stamps or anything Now, I know I've gone in grocery stores, and I have to watch what I buy, and yet the person that's in front of me on food stamps is buying a steak and everything else. Well, I find that kind of appalling also. I find it kind of appalling that the same people that may be on food stamps are selling cocaine and have enough money for that, but they're on food stamps. So, when we start pointing the fingers about pro-life and pro-choice in -- in a particular piece of legislation like this, that has nothing do with it, because if you read the papers about maybe fifteen

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

kids that have been home without their parents watching them, or the three kids that have been left home unattended, or the mother that's been working as a prostitute and the home burns down and all three kids perish. I've been there. I carried those kids out of these buildings. I know what it was like. So I'd be real careful pointing fingers back and forth about pro-life and pro-choice on legislation like this, 'cause it has nothing to do with anything like this. All this -- all they're trying to do is say, "You're not going to -- if you're going to have children, don't think you're going to rack up money by the State of Illinois for every kid that you have." That's all this bill says. And I just resent pointing fingers back and forth about pro-life and pro-choice on a bill like this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Will the sponsor yield, Madam President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

What is the -- what is the Public Aid budget, if you could tell me? What's the -- what's the dollar figures that we spend on Public Aid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I believe the question was what is the Public Aid budget. You can just shake your head yes or no. Is that what the question was? I -- I really have no idea what the Department of Public Aid budget is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR SHAW:

Do you have any idea how much money we spend on AFDC children?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The -- I'm told that the AFDC line, which is in the Department of Public Aid budget, is over a billion dollars for the first time, this year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

The -- the same person that gave you that information, could they give you the total figure for the Public Aid budget?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Nearly seven billion dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw, put your light back on.

SENATOR SHAW:

Yes. Madam President, to the bill: It seems as though that this bill is designed -- they said that we're spending a billion dollars. Where does that other six billion dollars -- where does that other six billion dollars -- could you tell us where the other six billion dollars go?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

A good portion of that is federal matching dollars, and then, of course, a lot of it goes to Medicaid providers: hospitals, nursing homes, pharmacies, doctors, whatever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Shaw, you just have to put your light back on, sir. SENATOR SHAW:

Okay. How much of the -- the AFDC budget is matching dollars?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Fifty percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

So -- so what we are doing is spending five hundred thousand dollars on AFDC - that's Aid for Dependent Children. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I think you meant five hundred million, but that would be correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Five hundred million. You're right. That's what we are spending on -- on AFDC children. Mothers for -- for aid to dependent children.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I'm sorry. We were carrying on a conversation about the previous question, and I didn't hear your question. I beg your pardon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR SHAW:

We're spending five hundred million dollars on Aid for Dependent Children out of a seven-billion-dollar budget. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, that isn't correct, because fifty percent of -- well, a good portion of that seven billion is fifty-percent federal match also. We have to come up with one billion dollars to fund the AFDC program, and then when that happens, then we get federally reimbursed fifty percent of that cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

To the -- to the bill: What I wanted to get at here, what this bill is designed to do is to lead people to believe that AFDC mothers is receiving the bulk of public aid in this State, and that is not true. And to put this out on the Floor and to -- and to try and penalize children at the -- the children responsible for them being here. Now, who are we penalizing? The mother or -- the mother and the father, or the children? That's who we are penalizing here. And it seemed to me that this is a bad bill. What you should be saying is that certainly a great portion of our budget is spent on the senior citizens, and I -certainly I support that. You talk about six billion dollars, basically, spent on senior citizens and providers and health care, and they need it. And -- but what you want to do here is create some false atmosphere that AFDC mothers is spending this seven That's not true, and I just wanted to point that billion dollars. out. If you talk about it in terms of what the taxpayers of State finance, it's five hundred million dollars, opposed to six 106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

point-some billion for the other parts of the program. We should spend that money, because the seniors have paid their dues. Many of them are in nursing homes and so forth. But you should not go so far as to penalize young people who had nothing to do with them coming in the world, and then you talk about — on the other hand, you talk about, say, "Well, we want to get — to stop these youngsters from selling drugs." What you are doing, you are setting them up for a life of crime in terms — if this bill pass. And you — they have no alternative but to wind up in the penitentiary. Maybe that's what you want to do here. Maybe you're trying to create some economic development for people down in your district by locking up these young people. I don't think that's the way to go. I think this bill should be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Dudycz, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Madam President. I apologize, but I'd like to stand on a point of personal privilege. I have some guests.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

State your point.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

I have some guests in the -- in the gallery with us this afternoon. We do have some special guests, and some of them have already left. We have some senior citizens from my district, from Norwood Park, Jefferson Park, Edison Park, Oriole Park and the Immaculate Conception Choir, and I would just like for the Senate to welcome them. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Would you like to stand and be recognized? Welcome. All right. Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a quick question. There's

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

as well the no doubt by the -- Senator Raica's comments, as sponsor -- there is no doubt, I don't think anybody would disagree with the fact that if you have a welfare mother out there and her sole reason for having a child is to get more money, that's sort of disqusting. I don't think anybody would disagree with that. That's certainly disgusting that you're going to bring a child into this world, and the only reason is to pick extra seventy bucks a month. That's nuts. However, I don't know -- was there ever a study done, meaning talking to mothers who've had their third and fourth child - these young mothers? Was there ever a study done to find out how many mothers would truly answer, The only reason I had a child was because I wanted to pick up seventy dollars." Because I would -- I would submit that there are other reasons they have these children. Maybe wrong reasons, but I would think that it's -- the main reason isn't -- isn't because they're trying to pick up seventy dollars, and -- and I think that's what you're doing here, is to try and stop that practice. And I don't know if this bill will stop the practice. If I thought the bill would stop the practice, I'd think it would be great, but I don't see that you're going to see impact of unwed, young mothers having babies -- or stop having babies because of this bill. And one last thing: you know, sometimes as a freshman Senator - and I certainly won't speak for Senator Hendon, because he could defend himself - this is a real emotional issue, and it's very difficult being a first-termer trying to figure out how far this emotion takes you. So, that's the question to Senator Watson, about whether they've done studies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. There's -- not necessarily studies have been

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

done, and it'd be hard to do that, as you would imagine. have had -- once the publicity of this particular bill was -- got out in my particular area last year, I had a physician contact my office whose -- probably his practice was ninety percent public aid - easily ninety percent - maybe -- maybe greater, who said that there are those who have additional children for additional benefits. He had people come in and would refuse to go on birth control pills, would do any -- would -- would refuse to do anything that would prevent that kind of pregnancy or a pregnancy in the future. And oftentimes, the statement would be made that "You would be impacting my ability for -- for funds And a physician -- I asked this particular physician to come up here and testify in committee, because this question gets asked a great deal. And it's -- and I appreciate that and I understand that. But he -- he -- obviously he would not do that, and then he said that to me in strictest of confidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Yes. Just -- just quickly, to the bill: You know, if I -- if I thought for a second that these fourteen-, fifteen-, sixteen-year-old, young girls that are -- that are having these babies -- if I thought for a second that most of them were doing it because they're trying pick up seventy bucks a month, I'd vote for this bill. I think that the majority are having them for other reasons, mostly primal or whatever urges that come over them. I don't think when they're -- when they're conceiving these babies that they're thinking of the fact that, "Hey, let me do this and let me commit this act so I could pick up seventy bucks." So I think the gist of the bill is going to wind up hurting children and hurting mothers more than helping them. So I urge a No vote.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer, for a second time. SENATOR PALMER:

Madam Chairman, I apologize for rising for a second time, but just feel very strongly about this bill. And perhaps when the first man has a baby, he will understand that one does not through that pain for seventy more dollars a month. I just want to point out to the Body that the Children's Defense Fund has pointed out that one -- at least one out of four children in America is poor, and that is across the board, whether that -- the mother of that child is on AFDC or not. And I would suggest to you that as much as we may -- and I certainly understand some concern and -- and anger about mothers who are not, to our way of thinking, being as caring about children as they should, but with -- until we come up with another system by which we take care of the children, by passing this kind of legislation, you are, in fact, punishing the children, whether you mean to or not. really urge you not to continue to punish parents by way of children.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon, for a second time.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to also respond to that, but I couldn't put it any better than Senator Palmer. That's a lot to go through for seventy dollars a month. I also want to point out that a box of Pampers in -- in today's world - I have a two-year-old - they cost five dollars for the -- and you get about sixteen, and they run through them in two days. So you quote that across a month and it's gone. Then you have milk; then you have baby food; then you have a lot of other things, and believe me, seventy dollars - you can't raise a baby on seventy dollars a month any way. So -- so to say that they're having

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

these babies just to get seventy more dollars a month is a ridiculous statement. And -- reason why your doctor friend didn't come and probably testify, he probably didn't want to perjure himself before the Senate. And I guarantee you that same doctor will scream bloody murder for his Medicaid payment to be on time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka.
SENATOR TOPINKA:

Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I don't think anybody is suggesting for a moment that money is the only reason that youngsters are being born in -- in very economic times and economic conditions. However, I think when we start looking at just the physical act of having child after child, responsibly speaking, some economic decisions have to be made by all families and by all individuals who are involved. that -- that covers and transcends all socioeconomic bonds and all socioeconomic areas and all socioeconomic trends. Everybody owes that to -- to civilization; that they make those economic decisions in terms of what they are doing when they have children and how many they have and where they go forward. This program has been passed in New Jersey, Wisconsin and California. It is working successfully. There is nothing in the government today. We are -- we are not a nation like other nations in history on occasion have had monetary bonuses for having children. don't think any -- any group in society in -- in America today has that going for it. We don't deny -- we don't deny other programs, Nobody's -- nobody is like food stamps, medical assistance. putting these children on the streets, but we are being very definite that you get one shot at it. After that, this money on It will not be there AFDC is not going to increase. incentive, if indeed it is an incentive for some. It is a fair bill. I think it lays out parameters of economic responsibility,

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

and I would seek its support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Watson, to close.

SENATOR WATSON: -

Yes. Thank you, Madam President, and I -- you know, I -- I could say a lot of things, but one thing that I don't -- I'm not trying to be punitive to anybody, and I -- and I can understand how some people may perceive this to be that, and that's not the intention of this. Senator Hendon brings up the fact these costs in relation to having a child, and that's exactly what we want people to do, Senator, is to realize the financial obligations of having a child and what those costs are. We want them to stop and think, and be responsible for their actions. That's what this is trying to do. You know, we -- we declared war on poverty in the -- in the sixties, and we've thrown an incredible amount of money at what we think is solving the welfare and I don't know what we've done. I think, in some cases, we've actually taken some steps backwards. I mean, because look what we have today. Our Medicaid budget is out of This country -- one out of four young people live in poverty. What have we solved by all the money we've thrown at the welfare problem since the mid-1960s? I don't think we've solved a great deal. What we need to do is somehow break that chain of generation after generation after generation of dependency on a system that is obviously broken and is in bad need of repair. And, Senator Palmer, you talked about and insinuated, to a certain degree, that I don't have -- that I don't have a poverty problem in my district. Well, I want to tell you: In one of the counties district, I had the largest percentage pregnancies of any county in the State - in my district. this problem, and we're trying to deal with it. This legislation

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

has passed in other states and has been effective. The Legislative Research Unit put together some information for me in regard to what's happened in New Jersey. And let me just give you an idea, and maybe this will address. Senator Molaro, some of your concerns, 'cause I can appreciate and understand your beliefs But since the bill was enacted in New Jersey, there has been a 13.7 percent reduction in pregnancies and births to AFDC mothers. Now, when you compare that to months from 1992 to 1993, August there was a decrease of 11.6 percent: September, 13.6 percent: and October, sixteen percent. That was in 1993. can see it's having an impact, and it actually is accelerating. So it is doing something. So maybe we don't have the statistics out there to prove necessarily that some of these -- that many of these people have children for additional dollars, but I think that the statistics in New Jersey help bear that out. And I want just read to you something from an inmate in Correctional Center. This is an incarcerated individual currently in Graham Correctional Center. He wrote a paper on welfare reform for a class he's taking while in prison, and I just want to just read to you a few short sentences here: "Although the welfare system provided only a little help, it was a means of survival for many young women, but the system opened itself to abuse in two different ways. First, in many instances, women had more children It was seen as a system that gave just to get more money. irresponsible young women tax-free dollars, and it became it seemed to encourage more babies, the welfare system, designed to help the single-parent family, instead became a Instead of encouraging responsibility, it force. seemed to encourage more children." This is from someone incarcerated in Graham Correctional Center who probably is a result or lived in a family of poverty. This may not answer, but it's certainly a step in the right direction. And I

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

would appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1525 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 37 Ayes, no -- 21 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1525, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Do I have -- Senator Burzynski seeks leave of the Body to go back to Senate Bill 1524. Leave granted? Leave is granted. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1524.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is probably the least controversial of any of the bills that we've addressed today, and basically what we're trying to do is provide that parents under age eighteen who have not received a high school diploma or GED equivalent is not eligible for AFDC. We're trying to encourage them to stay enrolled in school, to complete their educational process. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1524 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, 2 Nays, none

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

voting Present. Senate Bill 1524, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hall, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HALL:

I just wanted to -- on that last vote, that I voted Aye, I meant to vote No, and I voted O'Daniel No, and he wanted to vote Aye. So I just want the record to show.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The record will reflect. Senator Trotter, on 1546? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1546.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Smith, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SMITH:

Please, I'm sorry. I was running my mouth. 1524 - I want to vote Yes on that, because I'm a hyphenated sponsor. And if you'd be so kind, will you please change my vote from No to Yes, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Well, the record will reflect that, Senator Smith. Senator Trotter, on Senate Bill 1546.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Just so the record will show that I voted correctly on the last bill, and... On 1546, however, it provides that the Illinois Department of Public Aid in its annual report of the Healthy Moms/Healthy Kids Program, shall include information on the qualitative aspects of the program. Those factors should include, but not be limited to, the rate of immunization for children enrolled in the program compared to statewide immunization rates; it should include the rate of low-birth-weight babies born to women enrolled in the program compared to statewide

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

rates, the rate of premature birth for pregnant women enrolled in the program compared to statewide rates, and the degree to which pregnant women receive adequate prenatal care as defined by those who receive the number of office visits recommended by the American College of OB and GYNE physicians. The -- the purpose is intended to provide data on the quality of health care services delivered under that program. There was no opposition to -- to the bill in the committee, and it is in -- the proponents of the bill are the Illinois Maternal and Child Health Coalition, the Illinois Public Health Association, and the various other health service organizations here in this State. And I would like for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1546 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1546, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I made a -- I hit the wrong button on -- and I wanted to be recorded as voting Aye on Senator Burzynski's fine bill, 1524. So I'm Aye on 1524, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The written record will reflect that. Senate Bill 1560. Senator Jones? Yes? Madam Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1560.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1560, as amended, amends the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act, and what it does essentially is extends the sunset deadline from January -- I mean, December of this year until the year 1999. An identical bill did pass by Senator Geo-Karis. That's all the bill does. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1560 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1560, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. ...(microphone cutoff)...Geo-Karis, on 1567? Do you wish to have it recalled, Senator Geo-Karis?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Yes - to 2nd Reading, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Geo-Karis seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1567 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1567. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Read the -- the amendment, Madam Secretary. Oh. Sorry. Senator Geo-Karis, to explain the amendment.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, my amendment simply provides that this bill applies to the institutions of higher learning of the State, to public institutions and to other public institutions and junior colleges, but not to private institutions. And I move for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No other amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

3rd Reading. Senator Jones, on 1579? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1579.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 1579, as amended, will require the Department of Public Health, in conjunction with DCFS and the Department of Public Aid and other private, public and community agencies, to convene a committee to draft a plan to implement the Healthy Families Statewide Program to -- to prevent potential child abuse and neglect cases and encourage positive health and development. The program is based on the Healthy Family -- Families American model, as a voluntary program to identify at-risk family and at-risk children before they become

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

a problem. And it's to report to the Governor and the GA by January 1, 1995. Many groups have come together on this bill. It is a new model to try to save the children and save the families, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, question is, shall Senate Bill 1579 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, there are 58 Ayes, Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1579, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Watson, on Senate Bill 1594. Out of the record. Senator Tom Dunn, on Senate Bill 1598. Out of the record. Senator Fitzgerald? Out of the record. Senator Madigan, 1624. Out of the record. Senator Mahar, 1649. Out of the record. Senator O'Malley, on Senate Bill 1678. Out of the record. Senator O'Malley, on -- or, 1682. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. Sorry. Senator O'Malley, do you wish to have this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment?

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Yes, I do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1682 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1682. Miss -- Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator O'Malley.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley, to explain the amendment.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 1 reduces the size of the Chicago Board of Education from fifteen to eleven members. This is accomplished pursuant to the provisions of the bill by -- or the amendment, by abolishing the office of the four board members whose terms expired on May 15th, 1993, and still, as yet, have not been replaced.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any discussion? Seeing none, Senator O'Malley moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1682. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any other amendments for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

... (machine cutoff)... Philip, on Senate Bill 3rd Reading. 1685. Out of the record. Senator Maitland, on Senate Bill 1690. Senator Rauschenberger, on Senate Bill 1702. Out of the record. Senator Dillard, on Senate Bill 1705. Out of the record. Senator Maitland, on Senate Bill 1709. 1710. Senator O'Malley, on Senate Bill 1716. Out of the record. Senator Karpiel, on Senate Bill 1721. Out of the record. Senator Mahar. Senator Madigan. Senate Bill 1728. Out of the record. Senator Hawkinson, on 1730. Out of the record. Gosh - no takers. Senator Maitland, on Senate Senator -- Senator Barkhausen, on Senate Bill 1751? Bill 1733. Do you wish to have this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Barkhausen seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1751 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1751. there any Floor amendments approved for Secretary, are consideration?

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1 <sic> (2), offered by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Barkhausen, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment No. 1 <sic> to Senate Bill 1751 is merely a technical amendment suggested to us by the Chicago Bar Association, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Barkhausen moves the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 <sic> to Senate Bill 1751. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Floor amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

3rd Reading. Senator Weaver, on Senate Bill 1782. Out of the record. Senator Lauzen, on Senate Bill 1825. Out of the record. Senator Watson, on Senate Bill 1832. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1832.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Probably, as many of you know, the federal government has passed what they call the National Community Service Trust Fund Act, and it will be implemented in September of this particular year. It's an effort

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

to try to create volunteerism and getting young people involved in community service. The Lieutenant Governor's Office has a mechanism by which to implement some of the provisions of that particular Act. And what we're doing is simply saying that the Lieutenant Governor's Office of Voluntary Action Act, and it creates then the Commission of Community Service. And that would then allow us to comply with the federal guidelines and then enable us to capture some three million dollars in federal funds for this particular year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Any -- Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Watson, how much are we appropriating to the Lieutenant Governor now for this program, and if there's a three-million-dollar federal grant available, how much does the State have to come up with? Is it a matching grant, or do we have to come up with something to -- to come up with that money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

It's fully federally funded if we change the provisions of the current Commission that the Lieutenant Governor has to this particular language of "Commission of Community Service".

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson -- or I mean, Senator Welch? Excuse me. SENATOR WELCH:

But are we appropriating anything now to the Lieutenant Governor's Office that we're going to get back?

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, the Lieutenant Governor's Office administers about 2.1 million dollars in grants to schools and community-based organizations through this -- currently, through this Commission. So I would assume that that would -- that would continue or -- as long as we appropriate the funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Watson, to close. Question...

SENATOR WATSON:

Just ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Thank you, sir. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1832 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, No. 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 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1832, having -- received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Rauschenberger seeks leave of the Body to return to Senate Bill 1702 for the purposes of an amendment. Senator Rauschenberger seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1702 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1702. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Rauschenberger, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

In the course of developing kind of an omnibus repealer bill taking Statutes off the books that have been inactive - or apparently inactive - for fifty to seventy-five, and in some cases longer, number of years, we ran into an objection from the City of Chicago that was called to my attention by Senator Demuzio. And in an effort to accommodate both the City of Chicago and concerns that the Senator voiced, this amendment's offered to remove the General Assistance Tax Act from the repealer bill that we're going to be offering tomorrow for a final vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, are you trying to make this bill better so that you would make your predecessor look bad? You already have one bill that has passed this Body. This is rapidly taking you on to number two, and I want you to know that John doesn't think too highly of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, I'd also remind you that I do have two resolutions in, too, and I apologize. I will be seeking leave of the Body to apologize to ex-Senator Friedland when he has the opportunity to be here, but I'd appreciate approval for the amendment and returning the bill to 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Rauschenberger moves the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1702. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments for discussion, Madam Secretary?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

3rd Reading. Now, are there any Members who wish to have bills that are on 2nd Reading moved to 3rd? Senator Sieben?

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Yes, Madam President. Senate Bill 1628. Amendment No. 1 was considered in the Education Committee, and I would like to move for the adoption of that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

On the Order of 2nd Reading, on page 2 of your Calendar, is Senate Bill 1628. Senator Sieben. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1628.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? Senator Sieben, on...

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No committee amendments. Floor Amendment No. 1 was approved for consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Sieben, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 adds clarifying language to the underlying bill to make it clear that the taxing authority of special ed cooperative education districts is limited at fifteen cents for a dual district, thirty cents for unit districts, and it also clearly adds the language so that this -- this taxing

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

authority is limited by the tax levies of the various education fund, transportation fund, building and maintenance fund. Creates no new taxing authority for these special ed cooperative districts, and I'd move for the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Sieben moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1628. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments for adoption?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

3rd Reading. Senator Dudycz, on Senate Bill 1701. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

... (machine cutoff)...Bill 1701.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

3rd Reading. Anyone else wish to move a bill from 2nd to 3rd? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I have a number of bills in Rules I'd like to move to the Order of 2nd Reading, if I could, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL.

To make an announcement, and I hope all the Members of the Executive Committee are listening. We will meet tomorrow morning at 9:30, not 9 o'clock. 9:30 in Room 212, to hear resolutions that have been placed, I hope, on an agreed bill -- agreed-resolution list. If you're all there on time, it shouldn't take more than five or ten minutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAICA:

Purpose of a committee announcement, if I may, Madam President. At 3 o'clock, Local Government and Elections will meet in A-1 in the Stratton Building. We should only be there five to ten minutes. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Butler, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BUTLER:

Just a reminder, Madam Chairman, that the Commerce and Industry will meet tomorrow morning - set your clocks early - 8 o'clock. 8 a.m. Room...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Demuzio...

SENATOR BUTLER:

Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you. There is also an amendment in Executive Committee tomorrow, so I would remind the Members that there's other matters other than resolutions pending before us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I'm sorry, Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio. Tomorrow we are only hearing resolutions. We will have amendments on Thursday. Don't ask me why. I thought we were going to hear amendments as well, but we will hear only the resolutions tomorrow, and those are only the ones that have been put on an agreed list, noncontroversial, agreed-list resolutions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Madam President. Just an announcement that the Senate Committee on Appropriations will meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President. There will not be an Ag-Conservation Committee tomorrow morning. That's on your Calendar at 8 o'clock. Again, there will not be a meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President. The Senate Environment and Energy Committee will meet at 4 o'clock in 400 to consider three amendments. It should be quick. Don't be late, or you'll miss it

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Thank you, Madam President. The Senate Financial Institutions

Committee has a meeting at 4 o'clock in Room A-1. We have two

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

bills, each with one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

To announce the Education Committee will have a hearing tomorrow at 10 o'clock, A-1, in Stratton Office Building at 10 o'clock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Ralph Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you. Local Government and -- whoop, whoop, whoop. State Government Operations and Executive Appointments will meet this afternoon at 3 o'clock, Room 212. We have one amendment to consider.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

The Transportation Committee will meet at 3 o'clock. We have just a couple of amendments. In Room 400. If everybody's on time, we should be out very quickly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Madam Chairman. Tomorrow at 4 o'clock, Public Health and Welfare, very quick, A-1, Stratton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Madam President. I heard Senator Karpiel -- Chairman Karpiel identify that resolutions are up tomorrow. I just wanted to ask Senator Karpiel if my resolution is on that list, and if that's up tomorrow.

106th Legislative Day

April 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

All the Members who have resolutions that are on the agreed list have been notified. If you have not been notified that your resolution is on that, you don't have to bother coming to committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Resolutions.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1282, offered by Senator Watson.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Motions -- or, Madam Secretary, have there been any motions filed?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Hendon has filed four discharge motions with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 73 and Senate Bills 223, 1119 and 1166.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Madam Secretary, the Chair requests that the motions be printed on the Calendar. So ordered. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Carroll moves that the Senate stand adjourned until noon, Wednesday, April 20th. Noon tomorrow. Senate stands adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

94/11/03 12:07:23

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

APRIL 19, 1994

MINIE 13	7, 1777			
OTHER			PAGE	7
	NG			7
				13
	TNG			5
				14
	NG			15
				16
THIRD READI	NG			17
			_	5
				25
THIRD READ!	NG			32
				33
			PAGE	4
			PAGE	6
			PAGE	34
			PAGE	37
			PAGE	41
	NG		PAGE	42
			PAGE	76
OTHER			PAGE	77
OTHER			PAGE	78
THIRD READ!	ING		PAGE	58
OTHER			PAGE	77
SECOND REAL	ING		PAGE	4
THIRD READ!	NG		PAGE	77
THIRD READ	ING		PAGE	78
RECALLED			PAGE	79
THIRD READ!	NG		PAGE	80
SECOND REAL	ING		PAGE	87
RECALLED			PAGE	81
	DING		PAGE	88
			PAGE	85
			PAGE	82
			PAGE	4
			PAGE	83
			PAGE	1
			PAGE	1
			PAGE	2
			PAGE	2
				2
			PAGE	2
				2
				2
				3
	OFFERED			92
				2
			-	2
				2
RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	2
	OTHER THIRD READI RECALLED SECOND REAL RECALLED THIRD READI SECOND REAL THIRD READI THIRD	THIRD READING RECALLED SECOND READING THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING SECOND READING OUT OF RECORD THIRD READING SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING THIRD READING THER THIRD READING THER THIRD READING THER THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED RECALLED RECALLED RECALLED RECALLED RESOLUTION OFFERED	OTHER THIRD READING RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING THIRD READING SECOND READING OUT OF RECORD THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING RECALLED THIRD READING RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED RECALLED RECALLED RESOLUTION OFFERED	OTHER THIRD READING PAGE RECALLED PAGE THIRD READING PAGE THIRD READING PAGE SECOND READING PAGE THIRD READING PAGE SECOND READING PAGE THIRD READING PAGE THIRD READING PAGE THIRD READING PAGE RECALLED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-SENATOR GEO-KARIS PAGE	1
PRAYER-REVEREND LOREN RASBURY PAGE	1
JOURNALS-POSTPONED PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE	36
ADJOURNMENT PAGE	92