122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

...(microphone cutoff)...will come to order. Perfunctory Session. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to Committees: To the Committee on Executive - Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2150.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The Senate will reconvene at 2 o'clock.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 88th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the galleries please rise. Our prayer today will be given by Jeff Chitwood, Associate Minister of the South Side Christian Church, Springfield, Illinois. Mr. Chitwood.

REVEREND CHITWOOD:

(Prayer by the Reverend Jeff Chitwood)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journal of Friday, May 13, 1994.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Mr. President, I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to approve the Journals just read. There being no objections, so ordered. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, May 17th, and Wednesday, May 18th, in the year 1994, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objections, so ordered. WICS-TV and WAND-Channel 17 have requested permission to tape the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Watson, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports
Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 2107 Be Adopted, Amendment 5 to
House Bill 3244 Be Adopted, and Amendment 2 to House Bill 3457 Be
Adopted.

Senator Karpiel, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2150 Be Adopted.

Senator Topinka, Chair of the Committee on Public Health and Welfare, reports Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 539 Be Adopted, Amendment 2 to House Bill 742 Be Adopted, Amendment 1 to House Bill 1391 Be Adopted, Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1853 Be Adopted, Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2221 Be Adopted, Amendment 3 to House Bill 2424 Be Adopted, and Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to House Bill 3278 Be Adopted.

Senator Mahar, Chair of the Committee on Environment and Energy, reports Amendment 2 to House Bill 298 Be Adopted,

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Amendment 2 to House Bill 1352 Be Adopted, Amendment 2 to House Bill 1594 Be Adopted, and Amendment 4 to House Bill 44 Be Adopted.

Senator Barkhausen, Chair of the Committee on Financial Institutions, reports Amendment 1 to House Bill 902 Be Adopted, and Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3611 Be Adopted.

Senator DeAngelis, Chair of the Committee on Revenue, reports Amendment 3 to House Bill 410 Be Adopted, and Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2631 Be Adopted.

Senator Fawell, Chair of the Committee on Transportation, reports Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1513 Be Adopted, Amendment 1 to House Bill 3094 Be Adopted, and Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3551 Be Adopted.

Senator Raica, Chair of the Committee on Local Government and Elections, reports Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1635 Be Adopted, and Amendment 2 to House Bill 1569 Be Adopted.

And Senator Ralph Dunn, Chair of the Committee on State Government Operations and Executive Appointments, reports Amendment 3 to House Bill 99 Be Adopted, and Amendment 6 to House Bill 3587 Be Adopted.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 157.

Adopted by the House, May 18, 1994. It's congratulatory, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

House Bills 3032, 3449, 3455, 3798 and 4009.

All passed the House, May 18, 1994.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1476 is offered by Senators Fawell, Philip and others.

Senate Resolution 1477, by Senator Syverson and all Members.

Senator Dillard offers Senate Resolution 1478 and 1479.

Senate Resolution 1480, by Senator Bowles.

Senator Jones offers Senate Resolution 1481.

Senate Resolution 1482, by Senator Smith.

Senate Resolution 1483, Senator Rea.

Senate Resolution 1484, by Senator Stern, as is Senate Resolution 1485.

They're all congratulatory and death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HARRY:

And Senate Resolution 1486, offered by Senator O'Daniel.

It's substantive.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Committee Report.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

committees: To the Committee on Appropriations - Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 6, Amendment 2 to House Bill 8, Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 9, and Amendment 1 to House Bill 1883; to the Committee on Education - Amendment 7 to House Bill 2638, Amendment 6 to House Bill 3244, and Amendment 3 to House Bill 3457; and Be Approved for Consideration - Amendment 2 to House Bill 343, Amendment 7 to House Bill 381, and Amendment 9 to House Bill 1705.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

May I have your -- your attention for one minute. Maybe a little explanation for the fire drill. Evidently there was a small fire in the Rathskeller. I understand everything is under control. And secondly, as you know, tomorrow is the last day for House bills in the Senate. So I hope everybody understands that, and that we would try to move things in 2nds and 3rds today as much as we can. The more we do today, the easier and the faster we'll get out of here tomorrow. And it's the last day for 2nd Readings. Senator del Valle, for what purpose do you rise?

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to request a Democratic Caucus immediately in Senator Jones' Office.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

That request is always in order. How long do you need? SENATOR dEL VALLE:

About an -- about an hour.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Well, it is quarter after 3. How about 4 o'clock. All right. There will be a Democrat Caucus, and we will hopefully get back here by 4 o'clock. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Purpose of a point of personal privilege, sir.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm delighted to have two of my constituents here with me today, our Honorary Page, who is a Girl Scout, Erin Logan, and her mother, Karen Logan, from Waukegan, Illinois. I'd like you to welcome them.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Please rise and be recognized by the Senate.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'm sorry -- I got the wrong name. It's Karen Bales and Erin Bales. Sorry. From Waukegan, Illinois.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you -- thank you, Senator. Will you please rise and be recognized by the Senate. All right. The Senate will stand at ease till 4:15.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The Senate will come to order. On page 7 of your Calendar, on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 410. Senator DeAngelis? Do you wish -- do we -- do you wish the bill read for a second time? Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 410.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Revenue defeated Amendments 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator DeAngelis and Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 3 becomes the bill. This is the bill that freezes the assessed valuation for seniors after sixty-five who have household incomes of thirty-five thousand dollars or less. There was a serious concern that there may be some people who would take advantage of this. For instance, Senator Berman thought that he may want to move in with his kids, take possession of the house and then get the exemption. And I said that if his kids wanted to do that, they deserve the exemption. But essentially, what we're doing is, they have to affirm the income. They have to send a copy of the first page of the taxpayer's most recently filed federal income tax form, and this will be done on the basis of income, including tax-free income, to prevent those fat cats, like Ross Perot, who might decide to buy a house in Illinois, from getting the exemption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I just want to compliment Senator DeAngelis for these changes that I think improve the purpose, or more fully achieve the purpose that he had in the original bill, and I'm pleased to be a cosponsor. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Any further discussion? Senator DeAngelis moves the adoption of -- Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 410. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Shaw, do you wish -- on 610? Out of the record. Is there leave to come back to 1129? Leave is granted. Senator Watson, on 2107? Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2107.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Topinka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is Senator Topinka on the Floor? Senator Watson, do you wish to handle the amendment? ...(microphone cutoff)...Topinka will be here very shortly. Senator Topinka, on Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1129 <sic>. Would you explain the amendment? Excuse me. House Bill 2107, Senator Topinka. You filed Floor Amendment No. 2. Take it out of the record. Senator DeAngelis, on 2631? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2631.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Floor Amendment No. House Bill 2631 does the following - as you can see, I am heavily flanked by members of the Department of Revenue - it has some significant administrative proposals requested by that Department, and I would ask you to look at your fact sheets and respond --I'll be happy to respond to any questions. But it's pretty And maybe we ought to look at that on 3rd Reading, extensive. rather than now. It does some technical clean-up language on Senate Bill 522 that was passed last year. It restores or brings back Senator Klemm's bill, which got bottled up or died somewhere or it's floating around in the House, on raising the allowable tax abatements from a million to three million dollars. It has on it an amendment that was requested by Senator Jacobs which allows the abatement of certain residential property in flooded areas for up to five years. Be happy to answer any questions on that amendment...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2631. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 permits a builder of condominiums and townhomes the same opportunity for a model facility as is afforded to a single-family residence. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. 3 be adopted. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Floor Amendment No. 4 permits the increase of the current training tax expense credit from 1.6 percent to two percent. This is a training credit given to employers who invest in the training in technical and semi-technical jobs and skilled and semiskilled jobs. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. On this one, I stand in opposition, and I'll tell you why. We had extensive discussion in committee on this one. First of all, I think the Body needs to know that at this time, the Department of Revenue is currently working on regulations for the credit that is given to manufacturers, and if you have read anything about this -- this credit, you know that it was instituted in 1986, which means that for the time between 1986

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

and currently, we have no information about what this bill -- what this credit has accomplished; we have no information about anything of substance. So that what, in effect, we are doing is raising from 1.6 to two percent contributions without any evidence. Now, I would suggest that we vote No on this at the time, let it come back again later, because the Department of Revenue is currently working with some of the top corporations in Illinois to come up with the kinds of rules that I think would give us a lot more confidence in voting for this. The bottom line is that we are giving away money, and we have no evidence that we have even used the money we gave away in the first place effectively.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Mr. President. I want to add to what Senator Thank you, Palmer has said. This is an amendment to House Bill 2631, the two previous amendments we've talked about today, and the bill itself, is essentially noncontroversial, and there are parts to this bill that the Department of Revenue says we have to pass quickly. I would just suggest - and I this to the sponsor in committee; he didn't agree with this suggestion, but I'm suggesting it to the Members on this Floor this amendment may sink this bill. It doesn't help a bill that, other than this amendment, is essentially noncontroversial. is no reason why we should increase this credit when we don't even know what the existing tax credit goes for. The Department of Revenue is seven years late in promulgating the -- the rules and regs as to what is the basis for this. We shouldn't be And I just think if you want the rest of this bill, the bill that -- the amendment that -- that we just adopted, the other amendments on this bill, and the bill in itself, we ought to take

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

this amendment out of it. Vote No. Let's move ahead with the rest of the bill, which is good. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I too would rise in opposition to this amendment. What we're doing here is taking 1.2 million dollars out of the Treasury, giving it to corporations. It's the same as if we passed an appropriation bill to do it. It's going to exact effect. We're going to be voting on some have the same. budget bills later today, and you're going to see a lot of programs you want, left out of the budget. But what you're doing right now if you vote for this, is you're taking 1.2 million dollars out of the Treasury that's going to have to come from somewhere else, that we're handing over to corporations. addition, this proposed amendment, we really don't know what it applies to. In the committee I asked the witness: apply to individuals at McDonald's when you go to the drive-up window and they use the radio-control device to talk to you at the drive-up window? She didn't know. It is a technological improvement, so it fits within the definition of the bill. I don't think we need to apportion 1.2 million dollars for proposals like that. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I totally disagree with my two previous colleagues that are opposed to this amendment. I think this is the best amendment on the whole bill, you know. And -- and I'll give an example: Businesses use this to retrain people that have been laid off from work and -- and we have a lot of coal miners, a lot of oil-field workers down in

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Southern Illinois that lost their jobs, had to be retrained, and they're doing that at General Tire; they're doing it at the Walgreen Distribution Center. And I think this helps create jobs and get people off of -- off of workmen's comp that are -- and also off of welfare, maybe. I think this is -- this is a good piece of legislation - good amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just find it amazing that this bill -- this amendment is being proposed by the same sponsor who, when we get to 3rd Reading, is going to have a bill to raise property taxes on individual homeowners. And I'm not against having a tax credit for businesses, but you can't have it both ways. You can't just give tax breaks to businesses while raising taxes on property owners.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, to close. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I realize that there's some concern, and it is honest concern that we're going to address on the fact that the Department of Revenue was unable to answer some questions about this program. But, you know, there's an old expression that says when a man hits a dog with a stick, the dog bites the stick. Well, why are we going to punish the people that are very productively working in this program because somebody else does not have the information? Let me -- two facts are well known: One is that there is a strong demand for these monies; number two, there's a scarcity of resources. Now, I have to tell you that -- Senator Welch says this is a gift. It is not, because the employer is having to match far more than what this grant is in the program. And I have to tell you, if putting people to work

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

is a drain on the State's Treasury, why don't we just fire everybody?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2631. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. There's been a request for a roll call. Those in favor of -- Amendment No. 4 will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 38, the Nays are 13, 5 voting Present. Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2631 is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Petka, on 2938? Senator Petka? Out of the record. Senator Raica, on House Bill 3094. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3094.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Raica, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 3094 is a Senator Dart bill, and this language -- is my impression, was agreed to. What it basically does is it allows a

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

police officer to request a blood, breath or urine analysis, and adds in additional language stating that this provision does not affect the applicability or the imposition of the driver's license sanctions under the implied consent Section of the current law. This has to do with people driving under the influence, and I just ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. -- Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3094 be adopted. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 3244. Senator DeAngelis. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3244.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis, to explain Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 simply removes the requirement from the State -- of the State Board of Education in terms of filing semiannual reports. Along with that, it is, as a Member of the Audit Commission, it -- it simply allows the monies

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

to flow into the Auditor General -- State Treasury for the Audit Expense Fund for the Auditor General's auditing of State agencies. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. -- Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3244 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Mr. President, can I take this out of the record momentarily and you come back to it in just a few minutes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Out of the record. Senator Fawell, on 3457. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3457.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Fawell, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is an amendment that has been worked on and agreed to by the IEA, the IMA, the State Chamber of

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Commerce, the State Board of Education, the -- the Association of School Boards and all involved in education. It requires Board to provide technical assistance on the school accountability process. Authorizes technical assistance by the State Board of Education to the schools. Allows school districts to file school improvement plans over three years, rather but it does require that each school district enter at least two school improvement plans minimum for each of the three years. Requires the State Board to file a report with the General Assembly after this is all done. Provides any staff development monies go down to the local districts to be able to be used and targeted by the school improvement council at the local level. After that money is used by the school improvement council and they have all six done, that money will continue to go to them to be used for staff development. And provides that unless it is specified in a collective bargaining agreement, the district in-service committee shall tell approximately how much time will be used in developing the school improvement plan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3457 be adopted. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Fawell, on 3551. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3551.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Fawell, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment combines several It is House Bill 3201, which contains issues. cleaned-up and substantive language agreed to by the State Police, Mid-West Truckers, Illinois Transportation Association, IDOT and the Association of General Contractors. The second provision is it allows the Toll Highway Authority to hire and fire its own attorneys. Third, provides that in unincorporated territories located within Cook County, the homeowners' association of a subdivision with at least a hundred permanent dwellings may erect direction or street signs at intersections within the subdivision. Fourth, the amendment also contains a provision requested by the Automobile Services Association, and this provision clarifies that recordkeeping for essential parts applies to used essential parts, and the Secretary of State has no problem. And I ask for your... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Fawell moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3551. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR WATSON:

SECRETARY HARRY:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Thank you, Mr. President. This adds language that would continue the quick-take provisions for the Southwestern Illinois Development Authority. We've had to extend this. It — it sunsets every two years, and we're extending it for another two years. We've done this on — I believe this is the third occasion, and I believe — it's similar language as what they have in the Quad Cities Development Authority. I would move for its adoption. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, generally quick-take is intended because you don't have time to go through the whole eminent domain process. If we needed quick-take whenever we passed this, why didn't they do it then? And if they need to extend it now, why don't they go through the regular eminent domain process and give the property owners the rights that eminent domain entitles them to? If -- if this is a long, drawn-out process, can you assure us this won't be extended again another time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, we've extended it -- this is the third time. And it was in the original bill. We put the provision in there to allow for sunset - a two-year sunset - and that's what we're asking again. The local Southwestern Illinois Development Authority has been involved in the riverfront development, and that's what this is primarily about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Is there further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.
SENATOR HAWKINSON:

But my point is, the reason that you ever need quick-take is because you don't have time to do the normal eminent domain process, which is to go in and have a hearing as to value and so forth. If this isn't -- if this isn't a process that is -- that is ready, why don't you just do eminent domain? I mean, why extend quick-take again, when quick-take is supposed to be a -- just what it says - "quick-take". And there should never be -- there should never be a need to extend quick-take.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. This is -- just a request from the Southwestern Illinois Development Authority. I really can't answer your question, Carl, as to why they can't go through the normal procedure. But I do know that it had a lot to do with the development along the -- the Mississippi River. Maybe Senator Hall can respond to that. I'm not sure. But it's the Jefferson-Memorial Expansion that was being developed along the Mississippi River in the metro east area.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of Amendment No. -- Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3551. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Dudycz, on 3887 <sic> (3587)? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

SECRETARY HARRY:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

House Bill 3587.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on State Government Operations and Executive Appointments adopted Amendments 1, 2 and 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been other amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Dudycz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Dudycz, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 4 had amended the Illinois Uniform Peace Officers Act <sic> to require that a police officer be informed in writing of his or her rights in an investigation not less than five days before interrogation. Senate Floor Amendment No. 6 reduces it to three days' notice required for -- before interrogation is required, and -- and this has been negotiated between the FOP and the Municipal League. And I would seek your affirmative support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of Amendment No. 6 to House Bill 3587. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. It is the intent to go back to the top of 2nd Readings and give everyone a chance to move their bill if they so choose. Senator Shaw, do you wish to move? Out of the record. Senator Topinka, on House Bill 1129. Read the bill, Mr.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1129.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Hawkinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hawkinson, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 4 does the following It increases the penalty on aggravated fleeing and eluding, when that results in bodily injury, by raising it to a Class 4 felony. It was an ISBA suggestion. It allows fingerprints to be submitted to the Department of State Police on minors arrested on Class X, Class 1, Class 2 or greater felonies. It adds the provisions of Senate Bill 1369, which allows State's attorneys to enforce the Cannabis and Controlled Substances Tax Act in regard for a portion of the proceeds collected. suggestion of a -- a provision out of Senator Maitland's area, it creates an aggravated reckless driving provision similar to aggravated DUI to make it a Class 4 felony if the reckless driving results in great bodily harm. And finally, allows a court to consider whether an alleged offense was gang-related in setting the amount or conditions of bail. I would ask for the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1129.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1129 be adopted. All in favor, signify by

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Syverson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Sieben, to explain Amendment No. 5. Senator Syverson. Excuse me.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 5 just changes the current County Code regarding work release and electronic monitoring. Currently we're limited by law to charging twelve dollars a day. This would allow us to raise what we charge to what the current going rate is for work release. I don't know of any opposition, and this should be pro-taxpayer and pro-counties. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 1129 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Watson, on 2107. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2107.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Are there further amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Topinka.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Amendment No. 2 would add language to provide that no lease for real property entered into by the Chicago School Board to an individual elected to public office shall require or authorize the Board to expend public funds for the rehabilitating, remodeling, repairing or performing improvements to such property. And this would apply to any leases entered into or modified, renewed and extended after the bill's effective date. And that's what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Yeah. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

She indicates she will, Senator.

SENATOR SHAW:

Would -- I don't quite understand this amendment, and I just want to get some clarity in it. If I rent -- if the Board of Education rent me office space in the building and it's not in my lease that I should repair the building, you're saying that under this amendment, would prohibit the Board from doing -- making any repairs on its property?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

That is correct. They could not rehabilitate your building. You would have to have that agreed to beforehand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Shaw.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR SHAW:

Well, can any other citizen -- could I as a landlord do the same thing and just allow the building to run down in the -- and keep the tenants in there if they didn't negotiate that with me? Would they be required to repair the building?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

I don't think I understand the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Shaw, can you restate your question?

SENATOR SHAW:

Excuse me. You caught me getting a sandwich here. But what is the -- what would be the norm if I, as the landlord - you rented a place from me - under this amendment, could I withdraw from repairing your building and make you fix it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

You're talking about a private sector landlord? We are -- we are talking about a public entity, and I think that's the difference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

...the bill. To the amendment: I think the -- the Board of Education has a responsibility to repair its property the same as anyone else. If the rent has been negotiated and the renter is paying the Board of Education its rent that it asks for, and the building should be in rental condition, I don't think that the Board should be prohibited from making the necessary repairs on its own building because of the fact that I rented it. If -- if

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

-- if I'm paying -- if the Board rented me the building for fifty thousand dollars a year, what we are saying here is that if the roof cave in, I would have to move out or repair the roof myself. That's what you're saying in this amendment, and I think that is wrong. I think this is a bad amendment. I know the sponsor have good intentions, and want to save the taxpayers some money. But I think this -- you should look at this amendment again and -- and take it out of the record and then work on it and come back to it. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Topinka, to close.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

In response to Senator Shaw's comment, this would not affect the preexistent lease. That stays as -- as negotiated. However, following the adoption of this amendment, and should this bill pass and be signed into law, then this amendment would take effect on any future leases. I don't think it is -- it is the province of the Chicago Board of Education - and that is the only entity we're discussing here - to be renting public buildings to public officeholders and pouring public monies, which should going -- should be going into children and schools, which are falling down over the heads of children in Chicago - to make sure that -- that public servants are getting taken care of first and foremost. And I think it brings up the whole question of, should the Chicago Board of Education be in the real estate business, in general. I think this is a start. I would ask for a positive roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2107. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. Roll call has been requested. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

question, the Ayes are 38, the Nays are 10, 2 voting Present. Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2107 is adopted. Are there further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson, to explain Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. This clears up some problems that were in Amendment No. 1, and it involves the local school councils - their members, in Amendment No. 1, where it had mandated training. This takes the mandated training out and strongly encourages those people who serve as local school councils in the Chicago school -- schools to -- to go through the training. I ask for its adoption. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 2107 be adopted. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

There's a bill that's on 3rd Reading. I wonder if I could recall it at this time for 2nd Reading. No? It's on 3rd Reading now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

We're not on 3rd Reading at the moment, Senator. Senator Molaro, for what purpose do you rise?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President. To make a request and a motion that we move to page 12 and consider Motions to Discharge Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator, the motion is out -- out of order. We are on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bills. With leave of the Body, we will return to House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 3244. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Mr. President, House Bill 3244 was read a second time today. Amendment No. 2 was adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 5 was considerably debated in the Education Committee. It is the Education for Homeless Children Act, which puts us in compliance with the McKinley <sic> Act. There was a lot of discussion. There was some dissatisfaction with some provisions. I have submitted an additional Amendment No. 6, which will be heard tomorrow morning, but I'd like to get No. 5 on, and No. 6 takes care of some of the objections some of the people had.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator DeAngelis moves the adoption of Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 3244. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SECRETARY HARRY:

SENATOR HENDON:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. It is the intent of the Chair to now proceed to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Please turn your Calendars to page 3. And the Chair would like to remind the Members that tomorrow is the deadline for House Bills 3rd Reading, and all Members are encouraged to call their bills today. We will now go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, on the bottom of page 6. Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise?

Thank you, Mr. President. I attempted to get your attention. I -- I pressed my button before you went to 3rd Reading, to rise to ask that we go to page 12 for Motions to Discharge. You ruled Senator Molaro out of order because you were on 2nd Reading, so we have to do this in a lull. And you just reminded us that we -- we only have until tomorrow, and we have no chance at all if we can't get our -- our bills heard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Your point is well-taken, Senator. On the bottom of page House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 6. Senator Maitland. Bill No. 8. Senator Maitland. House Bill No. 9. Senator House Bill No. 44. Senator Mahar. Senator Mahar, do Maitland. you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Mahar seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 44 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 44. Mr Secretary, are there Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senators Mahar and Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. This is a clarifying amendment to a clean-up bill. I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? If not, Senator Mahar moves to adopt Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 44. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. On the top of page 4 are House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading. House Bill 61. Senator Madigan. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 61.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 3625 -- or House Bill 61, as amended, is the Governor's bill concerning the General Professions Dedicated Fund managed by the Department of Professional Regulation. It consolidates a number of the professional dedicated funds into the General Professional Dedicated Fund, which we created last year. It amends several of the professional licensing -- license. I would be glad to answer any question, otherwise would move for its adoption, or passage. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any -- any discussion? If not, Senator Madigan...(machine

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

cutoff)... The question is, shall House Bill 61 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 61, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 99. Senator Berman, do you wish this bill returned to the -- reading -- to 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment? Senator Berman seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 99 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 99. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 was requested by the Department of Transportation. It gives them the authority to -- to provide for rules and regulations to implement the body of the Act, which is the antiboycott legislation. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Berman moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 99. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

3rd Reading. House Bill 232. Senator O'Malley. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 232.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Bill 232 contains two specific provisions that were added by amendment. The first one will allow any municipality construct, own, manage, acquire, lease, purchase or rehabilitate property for senior citizen housing. Any new borrowing authorized by this language will require a front-door referendum. I want to make sure that everybody understands this is not mandatory; it permissive legislation. The second amendment added merelv language to the Section of the Municipal Code which permits municipalities to demolish dangerous and unsafe buildings. This language requires the municipality to notify the mortgage lender lienholders prior to taking any action regarding demolition. Additionally, the municipality shall publish the tax index number of the property, as well as the address of the building. This language is requested by the Illinois Mortgage Bankers Association in an attempt to allow lenders the opportunity to take corrective action against the property and relieve the municipality of doing so. Be pleased to answer any questions there may be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 232 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 232, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 298. Senator Mahar, do you wish this bill returned to the Order — to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Mahar seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 298 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 298. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Mahar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. Recently -- excuse me. Recently the federal government has ruled that boilers and pressure vessels under federal regulations that are located in nuclear facilities are not exempt from State Statutes. So, what this does is allow the Department of Nuclear Safety to engage in the activity of making sure that these are safe, and it provides for implementation provisions. The federal government is going to be developing treatment plans which we will implement. It creates a fund to receive anticipated federal grant and also provides an audit correction. I know of no objection, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? If not, Senator Mahar has moved the adoption of -- I beg your pardon. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I couldn't hear a word he said.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Well, that and -- I just couldn't hear any -- could you repeat what this -- what this amendment does?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

All right. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Welch, the — the federal government recently has — has stated that boilers and pressure vessels under federal regulations that are located in nuclear facilities are not exempt from State Statutes. So consequently, the Department of Nuclear Safety will promulgate rules and implement the federal treatment plans. It also creates a fund so that we can receive an anticipated federal grant of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and also provides for a correction that was recommended in a recent audit. I know of no opposition, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? If not, Senator Mahar has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 298. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 343. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 343.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 clarifies what was -- always been the intention and what I thought was in the amendment. It, once again, in a clearer form, indicates that this bill only pertains to Cook County. It does not extend any authority of any housing authority anywhere across the State. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Hendon. I beg your pardon, Senator Hendon. Senator -- Senator DeAngelis, do you wish that -- that House Bill 343 be returned to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment?

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Well, in that case, Senator DeAngelis seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 343 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 343. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. As I explained, this is a clarification of what was the legislative intent in Amendment No. 2 -- Amendment No. 1, which was adopted, and it means simply that this bill does, in fact, unequivocally apply to Cook County, and also that it does not expand any authorities for any housing authorities across the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Is there any discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator DeAngelis, will you explain to this Body why this is limited to Cook County and exactly what it does?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Hendon, the bill always pertained to Cook County. There were some people who thought that perhaps it wasn't clear enough. This is a technical amendment that affirms that fact.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The -- I -- I'm simply asking you, because when this was brought up in committee, I -- I believe it was statewide. Can you explain or -- or are you going to wait till 3rd Reading to explain what the bill itself does? Because some people may feel that it should not just be limited to Cook County if they know what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I will explain the bill on 3rd Reading. The bill, in fact, does say Cook County. All I did here is took care of a few people that might be a little overly concerned, that are paid money by other units of government, who maybe thought it wasn't that clear. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Overconcerned about what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

They were concerned that the -- it wasn't clear enough whether it did that, and -- that's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The Senate will stand at ease for a -- a couple of minutes. Hold onto your thoughts, Senator Hendon. We will get back to you in a moment. Senator Hall, for what purpose do -- do you rise, and please speak up.

SENATOR HALL:

Yes. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point, loudly.

SENATOR HALL:

That's -- that's a fire alarm. I've been around here a long time, and I think we should acknowledge that, and we ought to vacate the building temporarily.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hall, we are checking with the Secretary of State's Office. We have had a problem -- or the fire alarm went off earlier. We're just checking to see if this is the real thing or not. But, Senator, you are free to leave as you wish, if you so desire. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Yeah. I just don't want to lose any of us. I mean, that's the point. But with a fire purpose, and you know, you're taught to do this, so we ought to set an example.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

The Senate will stand at ease for five minutes.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Now, where were we? On Amendment No. 2 on House Bill 343. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I do want to say it was not my hot air that sent the alarm off. But there's a -- and this is very important. I'm trying to get a clarity here for a reason. And if the -- the distinguished and brilliant Senator DeAngelis would give me a straight answer, then we can -- people will understand the clarity, because we need to know what we're voting for. People need to know why this amendment should not apply to the entire State and just to Cook County, and I'm simply asking the distinguished Senator, and I'll ask him again: Why is that? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hendon, please -- please confine your remarks to the -- to the amendment. We're trying to go through the Calendar as much -- as fast as we can so that we can let you go home as soon as we can tomorrow.

SENATOR HENDON:

I -- I appreciate that, and I have a function tonight. I'd like to be there on time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

So would I.

SENATOR HENDON:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

But I'd like to know -- this is very important; this is very important. And people don't know how important this is, and that's why I have to know. Why is this amendment just for Cook County and -- and -- and what does the bill do? And then people will understand why -- whether they should vote for or against the amendment. But if people don't know, then how can they vote?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis,

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

In the words of George Bush, "Read my lips." For the third time, the bill itself limits it to Cook County; however, there were people who were concerned that there was some ambiguity in that, and that it might precipitate some legal action. This is a technical amendment that just simply clarifies both the legislative intent and what, in fact, is in the bill right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

To the amendment: This amendment limits this to Cook County simply because there's certain people who do not want other people living in their communities. It's as simple as that. And we should vote No on the amendment, and then vote No on the bill, because certain people that — the — the difference here is that certain people — they want to limit it to Cook County, to just punish the Chicago Housing Authority and limits its scope, while allowing other housing authorities in other — outside of Cook County to do what — what they want to do. And I urge a No vote on the amendment, and then I'll deal with the bill at — at the proper time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to remind my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle, when he referred to George Bush "Read my lips". Well, the people of -- of this country read his lips, and they voted him down. That's what should happen to this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

If there is no other discussion, Senator DeAngelis, to close. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, it's obvious that there's an attempt here to -- to misrepresent the amendment. I don't want to deal with the substance of the bill. I can tell you that Senator Hendon is as wrong about the bill as he is wrong about the amendment. So -- I would urge that we adopt this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 343. Those in favor -- roll call has been requested. That request is in order. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, 1 voting Present. And the amendment is adopted. Senator Hendon has requested verification of the affirmative votes. The request has been withdrawn. Are there any further amendments? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. We will pause for a moment to the Order of Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measure has been assigned to committee: Referred to the Committee on Education - Senate

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Amendment 2 to House Bill 2642.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senate Bills -- or, excuse me, House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading. House Bill 457. Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell. Out of the record. Senate -- House Bill 504. Senator Watson. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 504.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. Let's make it perfectly clear, it does not have anything to do with the Open Meetings Act now. We took that language out. We put in an amendment in there for the State Board of Education that would provide that if a district is certified as being in financial difficulty and fails to comply with the financial plan, which the financial plan being that established by its own board, then the State Board may rescind approval of that plan, and appoint a financial oversight panel for the district. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 504 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. And House Bill 504, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will return to the -- to House Bill 381. Senator Cronin, do you wish this bill returned to the 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Cronin seeks leave of the Body to return House

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Bill 381 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 381. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment 4 was the content of House Bill 3174, which was the Attorney General's bill, and it also includes portions of the Governor's WIC fraud bill. This amendment makes it a crime to use, acquire, possess or transfer WIC instruments — WIC instruments are Women, Infants and Children food aid — in any manner not authorized by law or rules of the Department of Public Health. The penalties are laid out in the bill, and second violations move all the penalties up one level higher. I ask for affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Cronin has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 381. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 5 includes five specific provisions, three of which have already

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

passed out of the Senate on unanimous roll calls. Real guickly. those provisions are: number one, the sum of Senate Bill 1698 that increased the penalty for certain FOID violations, raises the penalty for commission of armed violence with a semiautomatic or machine gun to a minimum of fifteen years; secondly, it adds the content of Senate Bill 1719 that passed the Senate unanimously, to extend the Firearm Transfer Inquiry Program to September 1st, 1996; thirdly, it adds the content of Senate Bill 1707 that passed the Senate unanimously, to increase the penalty on lawful use of weapons violations. There's two additional provisions in this amendment: number four, requiring that a person applying for a FOID card in order -- require that a person applying for a FOID card in order to possess a firearm be a U.S. citizen; and finally, it requires community service as a condition of continuance under supervision or probation in juvenile court on a minor delinquent on a gang-related or offense. I ask for a favorable -- okay. I'm going to clarify one point here. The next amendment, after we adopt this one, the next amendment will clarify that point, regarding a U.S. citizen -- a non-U.S. citizen and their eligibility to possess a firearm.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Cronin moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 381. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 7, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment clarifies that --

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

that previous statement. It prohibits illegal aliens from receiving a firearm owner's ID card, which precludes the lawful possession of firearms. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Cronin moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 381. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 539. Senator Philip, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Philip seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 539 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 539. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's a short amendment. It only amends the title. Hopefully this will be the vehicle for the Medicaid agreement, if we ever come to an agreement. So, I'll be happy to answer any questions, and move the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 539.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Philip moves the

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 539. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading. House Bill 696. Senator Petka. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 696.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Petka. Out of the record.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senate <sic> Bill 742. Senator Shadid, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Shadid seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 742 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 742. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Palmer.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment to House Bill 742 anticipates that there will be granted to Illinois several empowerment zones by the federal government - approximately seven downstate and one in Chicago. And it is intended to be consistent with one of the goals of the empowerment zone, vis-a-vis welfare reform, and that is to encourage self-sufficiency. It does that by giving the Department - Illinois Department of Public Aid - the responsibility for operating demonstration projects concerning the amount of resources a person may possess while retaining eligibility for benefits, in three ways: A demonstration that raises the maximum of countable resources that a recipient may retain; secondly, a demonstration that exempts from the calculation of countable resources the market value of automobile, to the same extent as authorized under the federal Food Stamps Program - in other words, brings it in line with that; and thirdly, a demonstration that allows recipients to establish a plan to achieve self-support - in other words, a plan of structured savings. It was agreed in the committee that this amendment would go to a conference committee, where it would be -the language would be added that this will only go into effect when and if Illinois does receive empowerment zones. I would ask for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Palmer moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 742. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 767. Senator Barkhausen. House Bill 902. Senator Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Recall. Senator Cullerton, do you wish this bill returned to the 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 902 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 902. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill is supported by the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association, which would replace the original legislation and provide that a mobile home park owner shall pay interest on a tenant's security deposit at a rate that fluctuates according to the current rate of passbook savings accounts. This language is almost identical to a current law which affects apartment landlords and tenants. Be happy to answer any questions, and ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Cullerton moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 902. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. On the top of page 5 of your regular Calendar are House Bills, Order of 3rd Reading. House Bill 1124. Senator Woodyard. House Bill 1352. Senator Karpiel. Senator Karpiel, do you wish this bill returned to the 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Karpiel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1352 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1352. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1352 permits utilities to engage in property sales up to three hundred thousand without ICC approval. The proposal also applies to rental, lease or easement agreements involving thirty thousand dollars or less.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Karpiel moves that the Senate adopt Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1352. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1391. Senator Demuzio. House Bill 1513. Senator Hawkinson. Senator Hawkinson, do you wish this

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

bill returned to the 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Hawkinson seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1513 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1513. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Hawkinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1513 changes all references within the Vehicle Code from handicapped persons to persons with disabilities. It amends the definition of pedestrian in motorized wheelchair and changes all references from hearing impaired to persons who are deaf or hard of hearing. This bill, according to the Secretary of State's Office, reflects the federal highway administration's published final rules regarding a uniform national system for parking for persons with disabilities, and I would ask for the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1513.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Hawkinson moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1513. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Hawkinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment 3 contains the substance of two bills that have passed the Senate. The first is the provisions of Senate Bill 1730, which passed the Senate 58 to nothing and contained the Secretary's zero-tolerance proposal. The second provision contains Senate Bill 1733, which was the —the compromise bill on fingerprinting and background checks for new school bus drivers, which passed the Senate 57 to nothing. I would ask for the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1513.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? If not, Senator Hawkinson moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1513. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. Senator Maitland, do you -- do you wish that Senate Bill -- or, House Bill 1569 be returned to the 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Maitland seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1569 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1569. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Demuzio. Senator Maitland. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much. This is an amendment that was adopted in committee this morning. What this does, it says that in -- in

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

small communities that have fifty thousand or less inhabitants, that you can also be an alderman of the city, as well as a member of the county board. And the reason for this amendment is that we were having some difficulty, in smaller municipalities, getting individuals to serve, and therefore, this would afford the -- the alderman of a city or a member of a county board to hold offices simultaneously.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? Senator Stern.

SENATOR STERN:

Just a minute. I just broke my -- I just broke my microphone. This is not an indication of how anxious and upset I am about this. No. I am not anxious and upset about this, but I think somebody should point out that there is a basic built-in conflict of interest if you are a member of both the county board and the city council or village board. I think that there are times when the interests of those two bodies come into conflict, and I just think we ought to point that out. And now I need a microphone fixer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Demuzio moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1569. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. Senator Karpiel, do you wish Senate -- House Bill 1594 be returned to the 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Karpiel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1594 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1594. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Mr. President, I'd like to table Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel moves that Floor Amendment No. 1 be tabled. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1594 is tabled. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 actually becomes the bill. And the difference between the amendment and the Amendment 1 is that this is dealing with Conservation 2000, and in the amendment we put in language that makes sure that the land acquisition portion of the bill makes it voluntary, makes it have a willing seller, and absolutely does not involve the use of eminent domain. It also changes a few things that were brought to our attention by the soil and water conservation districts, and they now are in support of the bill. And basically that's what the amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Karpiel moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1594. All those

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1635. Senator Butler, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Butler seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1635 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1635. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Butler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I'm sorry. I think it's Floor Amendment No. 2. Did we not do 1? Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yes. Amendment No. 1 responds to a very sharp eye by Senator Cullerton, who spotted a number wrong in the original bill. Instead of seven watershed plans, it should have said six.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Butler moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1635. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Amendment No. 2 requires the North Shore Sanitary District to —that any — to — that it — when it has any ordinance or rule which imposes penalties, assesses charges, or makes appropriations, that they shall first require public notification and public hearing before such ordinance or rule can take effect. And that's the only way to be fair, and I move for its adoption. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Geo-Karis moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1635. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Butler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 gives quick-take authority for a period of twenty-four months on a single parcel of property in connection with Palwaukee Airport expansion plans. The property owner had initially agreed to sell his property to the airport for drainage purposes, but then backed out. Unfortunately, that -- the -- the property is required to create a -- a change in the diversionary channel that -- that now is too close to two existing runways, and it violates the FAA safety standards. It also affects a -- a major IDOT improvement to Milwaukee Avenue. Without this, there -- the entire planning of that project would have to be changed. So I would urge approval of this amendment.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Butler moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1635. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1705. Senator Rauschenberger, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Rauschenberger seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1705 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1705. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 9, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Amendment No. 9 to House Bill 1705 corrects a repealer error that we had in drafting the language for the Blue Ribbon Procurement bill. It restores the full language of the State Printing Contracts -- Act back into the Statute books, and ties it to the -- to the sunset language we have for -- to work on the leasing Sections and in this Section in May 1st, 1996. I'd request its immediate adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Rauschenberger moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 9 to House Bill 1705. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it, and

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 1705. Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I'd like to seek leave of the Body to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator -- Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1705.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

This is the Blue Ribbon Task Force bill that we discussed at some length the other day in the Executive Committee -- in the Executive Subcommittee on Procurement, and on the Floor. It is comprised now of a total of nine amendments. The first amendment empties the bill; the second amendment contains the general provisions; the third amendment contains the policy organization; the fourth amendment's a procurement bulletin; the fifth amendment is source selection and competitive formation; the sixth is ethics; seventh is -- preferences; Amendment No. 8 deals with a enacting clause in case any of the other amendments fail; and Amendment No. 9 is the technical correction we've just adopted. We've kind of talked this bill to death. If anybody has any questions, I'll do my very best to answer them. I'd like to urge a favorable vote.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Some questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Rauschenberger, I certainly approve of the intention of this bill. I'm just wondering why certain areas are left out. For example, the University of Illinois Foundation. I could go on, but I'm sure you know, as with parts of CMS and so forth and so on. I'd just like to know why some and not all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, I'd like you to know we struggled with that, and tried to figure out what is proper and what is not proper require to operate through our State system. The negotiations and discussions ended up with the -- University of Illinois Foundation are private donation dollars that the University of Illinois gets. Although the Audit Commission and the Appropriation Committee of the Senate would like perhaps more oversight on those, in the interest of moving this bill forward, since the -- the Body -- or the General Assembly itself has no right to oversee those funds, we didn't feel like we could prevail if we tried to put those in the procurement bill, but I share your interest in them, the decision was made not to include them. As far as other exclusions, there are very few other exclusions at all. We did the very best we could to keep all agencies of State government involved. The Illinois Toll Highway Authority is included in this bill. The University of Illinois is included in this bill. the Board of Regents, the Board of Governors, included in this

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

bill. All agencies of the Executive Branch are included in this bill. We tried to keep it as -- as tight as we could.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this bill, because I learned long ago that half a loaf is better than none. We had a full loaf with the Blue Ribbon Committee recommendations after seven months of hearings and study, debate and dialogue between the public and private sector. While I applaud Senator Rauschenberger for trying to embrace many of those recommendations - and he has in this bill - there are two key provisions that I think are unfortunate that have been left out. One provision, embraced aggressively by the American Bar Association model procurement code, independent, unsalaried policy board that was a part of the Blue Ribbon Committee recommendations, and now has been made into a toothless tiger with the advisory board recommended in this bill. That's unfortunate. The second provision, which is troubling, and invites further scepticism toward elected officials, is that once again we're making a law that exempts ourselves. The General Assembly, the Judiciary are exempted from this bill, and I think But having said that, this bill does move that's unfortunate. Illinois light-years. We know that it was only two springs ago where the Governor dismantled the Purchasing Code and stripped it of what remaining competitive components were a part of the Code. I'm glad, at long last, he has come on board, and I think we ought to support this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've always been a firm believer

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

that most things happen for the best, and two springs ago when of my constituents, whose jobs were being eliminated in the procurement department, came to me, many of us were upset about But I think today we're going to pass what was happening. something that indeed is much, much stronger than we the last two years. I think the citizens of this State will be very proud of us for instituting some significant changes, which into the bidding process and make other substantive changes in purchasing. I also would like to comment that two days ago, the other side of the aisle was blasting bureaucrats saying how we, as elected officials, should have more responsibilities, and I think our decision to -- to eliminate the -- the extra layer of bureaucrats in creating an oversight board was certainly a good one that goes along with the comments of the other side of the aisle of two days ago. So I salute Senator Rauschenberger and all those who worked very hard to accomplish this compromise. And I'm sure that it is something that in the years to come we will be applauded for doing. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I served on the subcommittee with Senator Rauschenberger and others. And first of all, I want to commend Senator Rauschenberger for the many, many hours that he put on as chairman of the committee to work with the staffs and to check with every department and get a good bill. The bill, as it stands now, is even better than the original bill on procurement of supplies, and I might tell you that even Common Cause - Mr. Waters - testified, and he says he supported this bill in its present form. And I ask a favorable vote on it, because it is a much better bill, and I think it'll do far more good, because it even tightened the ethics disclosure

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

more than ever before.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I enjoy the talk about this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle, and it's very -- very encouraging, but for those of us who spent a number of months and weeks working with Blue Ribbon Commission with the public sector in bipartisan fashion, unanimously adopted a proposal that couldn't even get out of committee. And it was a proposal that was a good one, and so I wouldn't want to -- anyone to think somehow or other that this side of the aisle was doing anything other than supporting the concepts and the principles that were established by the Blue Ribbon Commission. Let me applaud the sponsor here for taking this issue and attempting to craft a compromise by which it could pass this General Assembly, and I certainly applaud his effort in doing that. But I would like to think that there was a little bit more bipartisanship involved with the bill than -- than I heard from some of the speakers here today. Again, I salute you for what you're doing. I think it's a gigantic step in the right direction. It will, in fact, afford us the opportunity to really put some good government teeth into things that we do around here, and it has been more than the last two years from which it has been needed. It has gone back two decades.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, having been a member of the Blue Ribbon Committee, I -- I will, indeed, miss the oversight board, because I -- I would have liked

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

to have seen it in the -- in the bill. But I know that compromise is a necessity to government, and I am far and away happier, I suppose, to give up the oversight board in terms of getting the ethical part of this bill beefed up, which Senator Rauschenberger has done with -- with a great deal of time and effort He really has -- has brought about, I think, a very excellence. I, too, would like to eliminate the idea of great bill. partisanship on the part of this bill, because a lot of contributed to the basic ideas that came out of the Blue Ribbon Committee that finally terminated in this -- in Senator Rauschenberger is probably the pinnacle of all of our work on the top of the pyramid. I think Mr. Waters from Common Cause has had a great influence on this bill. It -- it probably is one the best bills that this Body has put together in contributory fashion, and if we do nothing else this year but this bill, we have had a successful Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Any further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I would like to just stand here in support of the Executive Committee. When the Executive Committee put this into a subcommittee, we got a lot of editorials about how the Executive Committee was killing this bill. We got a lot of -- I got letters about how could I dare do such a thing. And I'm just going to stand here in support of the Executive Committee. Once again, this is the second time after the Freedom of Information Act was passed - I think last week - we got a lot of hits on that also, for putting it in a subcommittee, and finally worked out a -- a bill that everybody agreed to. You know, we talk about the Blue Ribbon Committee, and they did do a lot of work, and they did a lot of good work, but there is no task force around here that's sacrosanct, and we take their report and

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

just pass it into law without -- without looking at it, without maybe making some changes, and that's what happened here. And it is not bipartisan -- I mean, it is not partisan, and it is not -you know, the Governor didn't come on board late. He had a bill of his own. Senator Severns didn't take the Blue Ribbon Committee as a whole either. She had a bill of her own. Those bills were taken, and what we did is take out the whole issue and looked ít. Take the report, looked at it. Ť think Rauschenberger and the subcommittee and Bob Waters and Penny Severns and everybody involved in this issue - Judy Topinka -I also want to say, so did the Executive fine iob, but Committee. And maybe people should be a little bit less guick to assume that because we want to take a little more time and put it in a subcommittee and look at it, that we're just simply going to kill it. I think the whole committee has done a heck of a job. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

For the purposes of legislative intent, and to make sure everybody's comfortable at the definitions of -- of State agencies, I'd like to make it clear we did not intend the definition of State agencies to include units of local government, including community college districts. We wouldn't want our local educators concerned about whether we wanted to put them under ethics legislation, 'cause I'm sure they're doing that job all by themselves. And now, in -- in imitation of Senator Weaver, I'd like to urge a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 1705 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

who wish? On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays and none voting Present, and House Bill 1705, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1786. Senator Molaro. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1786.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the --House Bill 1786, as amended, is somewhat simple. Senate. Basically what it is, is that if a person is charged with a criminal offense, such as battery or armed violence, and the victim has -- happens to be a household member, such as a son or daughter or wife or spouse or mother, whatever it is, that -- and defined as such under the Domestic Violence Order of Protection, what they do now is a judge, as condition of bail when somebody is bonded out or gets an I-Bond, as condition of bail is that would stay away from the marital home for seventy-two hours and refrain from contact from seventy-two hours. That's the condition of their bond or their bail. Well, what's been happening from time to time is that some of these defendants, while out on bail, ignore this condition of their bond and will go to the marital home or will bother the victim on the job. Well now, what has to happen, when you call the police and he has reasonable grounds believe that this defendant is violating his bail requirements, you still have to go to court now and get a warrant. does is puts this in the class of a warrantless arrest, where if a police officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a defendant is in violation of his bail requirements, he can go out and make 122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

an arrest. After the arrest and he's brought in, of course he's before a judge as quickly as possible. This does -- this makes it where it's -- where a victim does not have to wait twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours or go in and make a complaint. This can be done quickly and you can protect the family member. So I would ask for passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1786 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present, and House Bill 1786, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1853. Senator Topinka, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Topinka seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1853 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1853. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Topinka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator -- Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Amendment No. 2 creates the Elder Care Savings Bond Law, and authorizes the State to issue up to three hundred million dollars in General Obligation Elder Care Savings Bonds. It's a program similar to that which we have for the State College Savings Bond Program, and is designed to help people save and invest for their health care and long-term care needs of their senior years.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Topinka moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1853. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Topinka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Amendment No. 3 adds a provision which amends the Health Care Surrogate Act and would give explicit authority to court-appointed guardians to execute do-not-resuscitate orders. Current law does not specifically set forth the authority for court-appointed guardians to act on the behalf of their wards. And...(microphone cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? If not, Senator Topinka moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1853. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1882. Senator Weaver. House Bill 1883. Senator Weaver. House Bill 2010. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2010.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 2010, as amended, continues the Office of Regional Superintendent of Cook County till August 7th, 1995. This bill is as distasteful to me as might be for those of you I'm going to ask to vote for it. But let me tell you why this bill is necessary. For those of you are concerned about GED being done in Cook County, this is the only bill that will continue GED, with certainty, in Cook County. For those of you who are concerned about bus driver training, this For those of you who are is the only bill that'll do it. concerned about whether there will be criminal background checks on bus drivers, this is the only bill that will do it. This will also do the other things that are necessary with that office. And I would like to have my downstate brethren listen, because if this bill does not pass, you will pay. And we have already passed a supplemental, which is nothing more than a token down payment on the cost of performing these services for Cook County, this doesn't go, the State Board has to pick it up; the continuity will be disrupted; the cost will be greater than what it is now. So as distasteful as this might be, it is the only alternative right now to do what I just said. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'll take the sponsor's language: as distasteful as this may be, and I just suggest that this is a very distasteful bill. The -- the questions that are raised by Senator DeAngelis are -- are legitimate. The trouble is that it has been the political motivations of a number of us - and I use

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

the in a very broad sense - that has brought us to this dilemma. We abolished the Office of Regional Superintendent three years ago when we passed a bill. That was act number one. Τf that had been the end of the story, I think it would have been very simple, but then came act number two, where the office reestablished, but not for all of Cook County, only for the suburban area, so that Chicago was cut out. I am sure we're There are times when Chicago is treated shocked by that fact. somewhat differently than the rest of the State by this Body. the problem is that we have a time gap between a position that constituents, and most of your constituents in Cook County, strongly supported - namely, abolish this office. We've abolished it for Chicago. We've abolished it for Cook County, outside of Voting for this bill re-creates that office. I don't Chicago. think that's what your voters wanted, and that's not what this Body wanted when we abolished that office. There are other alternatives. There are other alternatives. I think that the -passed an appropriation bill - a supplemental appropriation bill - to require the State Board to supervise testing for the balance of this fiscal year. And when we straighten out the budget for next fiscal year, I would that that money would be there for them to continue to -- to give the GED tests for all of Cook County. As far as the bus drivers, think we've got the Secretary of State that stands ready to do The other duties can be assumed either by the County of Cook or other agencies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

I beg your pardon, Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

I just think that this is contrary to what the voters of Cook County wanted, and it certainly - it certainly - does not give an adequate response to the needs of the people that are serviced by

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

this office that, in fact, should be abolished. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator del Valle.
SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I also stand in opposition to bill. Senator DeAngelis, you indicated that this is the only bill that would continue GED with certainty. Well, we just approved a supplemental appropriation of seventy-five thousand dollars for the State Board, so that the State Board can proceed to make arrangements for GED testing in Cook County, and we've also -- or, we will be approving a State Board budget that has money in it for GED testing for next year. What we're doing with this bill is we're attempting to undo all that. And we're attempting to undo all that for a short period of time. Because, let me tell you, in this bill, you're not taking care of Chicago; you're certainly taking care of the suburbs because your office, created through your legislation, will kick in at the end of a thirteen-month period in the suburbs, but at the end of that period, there will be zero, nothing in Chicago, because your bill does not create the office permanently in the City of Chicago. And what we'll doing next year is we're coming back to the State Board once again to ask them to begin to do the same thing they've done so far. And so what are we doing here? Why aren't we looking for a permanent solution here to this particular problem for the entire county, rather than just facilitating your transition in suburban Cook that works out beautifully for you, but does nothing for Chicago, where most - where most - of the GED test-takers Now, that's unfair. It's unfair. It's wrong, and I think That is not what we should be doing here. you know it's wrong. And we know that the county has indicated, Senator DeAngelis, that they are willing to take over GED testing totally - totally, but we haven't given that amendment a chance. That amendment was

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

voted down in the Education Committee on a partisan roll call. So there were options available. Now we're attempting to undo the option — the only option that has been available to us for ensuring that there is no interruption in GED testing in Cook County and in the City of Chicago. And now we're trying to undo that. That doesn't make any sense. Let's leave it alone for now. Let's let the State Board proceed. They're calling for a meeting. They sent out a letter to potential vendors for a meeting next week. By May 27th, they're scheduled to select the vendor. It may be the City Colleges of Chicago; it may be another, but they're already doing what we asked them to do. And now we're trying to undo all that. That doesn't make sense. I ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator LaPaille.

SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. On the bill: For those that don't know the entire history of the elimination of the Cook County regional superintendent, this has gone on for probably eight years And the leaders in this effort were basically suburban legislators - suburban Republican legislators. I remember Senator Topinka and Jack Kubik, over in the House, for years said that this was a useless office. And for years the Democrat-controlled House and Senate beat them back. And I was probably part of that in the role that I held in the House. And when President Phelan came in, he agreed with them, and we passed a bill to eliminate the office. And there was a phaseout, and the then Superintendent Martwick resigned ahead of time, and Mr. Lloyd Lehman was Mr. Lloyd Lehman was a bureaucrat that was appointed, and suddenly he got in that office and he sat in those nice chairs in this office, and suddenly Lloyd Lehman has become our -- our pen pal. I have never seen a bureaucrat who has lobbied to keep

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

his office and his position going after the State Legislature and the Governor has said, "This is useless; this is fat; this is bureaucracy. This is everything that we all say we are against — big government spending." This gentleman comes down daily to Springfield, with an entourage of individuals, to keep his office going. So this vote is going to keep this big bureaucratic office and bureaucrat going for another year and a half or whatever, simply because the desk is nice, the office is nice, the staff is nice, after — for years led on your side of the aisle by those two legislators saying that we don't need the office. So if you're for big government, and if you're for bureaucracy and bureaucrats, you vote Yes; if not, you vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, Mr. President. We just passed the new Procurement Act, and we were criticized on this side of the aisle for our attempts to pass a much stronger bill, but the entire criticism from the other side of the aisle was that, "Oh, we don't want to create that big bureaucracy. Those Democrats, they want the bureaucracy bigger." Well, hey, let's put up or shut up here. This bill creates a bureaucracy. If -- you know, let's be consistent. If you voted Yes on the procurement bill because you didn't want that bureaucracy, you should be voting against this bureaucracy here. So I hope all those same people who gave those nice speeches a little while ago will be consistent and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator DeAngelis, to close. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I said this was -- distasteful, because it is distasteful. But there's -- when it comes between the choice of starvation and having something distasteful,

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

you know, I'm really something distasteful should rule. And First of all, to clear the record, amazed at this rhetoric. Senator LaPaille, we passed it out of the Senate three times. And when you were Chief of Staff in the House, you were very skillful in ensuring that that bill never hit the Floor, 'cause if it had hit the Floor in the House, it would have gone through there like you know what. But, you know, it's utterly amazing that we talk about this bureaucracy that exists. Well, you know, folks, the bureaucracy is? Self-imposed. Self-imposed. And let me tell The law only required in Cook County -- only required that the County Board - that self-righteous group that suddenly found a new religion - had taken a political issue that we had all Okay? It requires only, Senator been aware of for years. LaPaille, a chair, a desk, telephone and an office. This corrupt group that was up there - this bureaucracy - was created because your Democratic County Board, including the man who tried to get rid of this - or he thought he was trying to do it - gave them the money to become the patronage haven. In addition to that, let me just tell you how self-serving they are. They, in fact, paid the superintendent more than what was required by State law. contributed an additional increment to his salary. This corrupt, no-goodnik, who was doing a function that was unnecessary. My, of a sudden we talk about hypocrisy and A11 mv. my. self-righteousness. Cut out the bullcrap, guys. It's all over there, when you -- what I've heard. Let me tell you something else: This is the only bill that will ensure the continuation. And when we went ahead and abolished that office - which, Senator Berman, I had a bill that was stronger than yours; you chose not to call the one that I amended of yours, and took the weaker one but you know what you did? You got rid of an official, but you didn't change the office. Those functions have to be done. also, to hear a downstater talk about this bureaucracy, hey, pal,

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

you've got one of those in your area. Why don't you abolish Because it's the same function. Okay? So don't get yours? self-righteous about that either. Now, the other thing is this: People talk about other alternatives. Let me tell you, there's only two bills that were entered this Session that took care the problem. One was entered by Senator O'Malley, a Republican, and another one's by Senator DeAngelis that took care of That good old county board - and I have to say my good old Republican commissioners on that board have got anybody else has on there - they didn't do jack-stank. In fact, we had meetings and told them this thing was coming down and we told 'em, and it wasn't till Superintendent Broncato wrote a letter to the county board and says, "Hey, pal, this deadline's coming up. What are you doing about it?" They did nothing. They did nothing. And -- and if like having to do this, I've got news for you. like watch -- this is like watching my mother-in-law go over car -- over the cliff in my new Lincoln. Very mixed emotions, pals. But I got to tell you, we have fourteen thousand -- we have fourteen thousand kids that need to be tested. Are we going get them tested? I don't know, but I can tell you right now, if this bill does not pass, GED testing is in jeopardy, and I would like to submit that roll call to everyone whose area becomes -who have people from their area who are concerned about this. And let me just say one thing in closing. I am tired of hearing thing about Chicago wasn't included. I'm not going to point any fingers, but when I put in that bill to restore suburban Cook, went to people from Chicago. You know what they told me? "Hey, man, we don't want to do that. That's too political." Now in here crying -- don't come in here crying, when you didn't want to play the game. Okay? Don't come in here and do You're like the person that killed their mother and father and

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

then throws himself on the mercy of the court 'cause they're an orphan. Cut it out. Okay? I move we pass this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 2010 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 25 Ayes, 33 Nays, 1 voting Present. House Bill 2010, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator DeAngelis. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I -- I studiously do not want to have consideration postponed, 'cause I want this roll call to be shown to everybody.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senate -- House Bill 2150. Senator Weaver, do you wish this bill returned to the 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Weaver seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2050 <sic> to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2150. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2150 basically does this: provides equity for Chicago; allows Chicago to construct a riverboat entertainment complex, subject to State gaming laws and local city council -- with local city council approval; authorizes up to ten new licenses statewide, includes Chicago, Cook County.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Each license will be for two boats. Specifically mandates the Illinois Gaming Board to consider minority ownership, minority employment; allows competitive bidding on tax rate by qualified applicants; requires local referenda for a new boat, excluding the City of Chicago; provides for financial incentives to the horse racing industry; and last, but not least, makes twenty-two separate business reforms that encourage long-term economical develop <sic>. Many of these reforms are fairly minor changes. But they'll have a big impact on the cost of doing business in Illinois. Had a full, thorough hearing today in Executive Committee. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor on the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator Philip, does this amendment, as drawn, preempt home rule?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

No, it does not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Could you then explain to me that -- the language on page 17 of the bill that states, "The Board may issue a license authorizing a riverboat to dock in areas of a county outside any municipality only if, prior to the issuance of the license...",

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

continuing on page 18 at the top, line 1, "...in the case of any license issued under this Act, the governing body of the county has by a majority vote approved of the docking of riverboats within such areas"? Now, if a county board says no to riverboats on the renewal of a license of an already existing riverboat that sits within a home-rule community, they in turn would need the county's approval, as I read that language, which would then supersede home rule.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

This Section requires a referendum in unincorporated areas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

With all due respect, that's not what it says, though. It says, in any case of any license issued under this Act, the governing body of the county has by a majority voted approval of the docking of riverboats within such area. That would be within the county.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Dunn, was that a question? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I think there -- the current law is there's two separate Sections. One's for the -- unincorporated area -- unincorporated area and the other ones are for within city limits. They're different.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well, to -- to the amendment: I think we have a difference of

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

opinion on the interpretation, because the language, I think, is — is quite the opposite and clearly states that there must be county board approval anywhere in the county. It doesn't limit it to incorporated or unincorporated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I won't belabor it. It's my understanding that the Senator has enough votes on the amendment. So we are not going to belabor the point. Let me ask a couple questions though, if I may. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Number one, on the bidding of the taxes, the wagering tax and the -- the bid as it states on page 2, "The Board shall award the license to the applicant whose application and bid, in the opinion of the Board, shall result in the greatest amount of revenue, in the form of wagering tax and...additional payments in accordance with the bid..." What if - what if - you have the best application with the best economic development, and you have the least amount of tax? Which is going to be the overwhelming -- the weight of the factor? Because as it states in the law, it's going to be in the opinion of the Board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

It would be the overall revenue, and the Gaming Board would make that decision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR JACOBS:

So what we're saying, contrary to the desire to get more tax money, that very well may not be the issue. Question number two, whenever we are determining which licenses shall be awarded for a ten-year period now, rather than a three-year -- we're going to lock these people in for ten years when we don't know what's going to happen to the future of riverboat gaming. But has any consideration on those boats that are currently in operation -- will there be any consideration given for past experience, past tax revenues given, and are the current licensed boats just going to stand the risk of being put up for forced sale?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Absolutely what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yes, they will be taken in consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, the bill doesn't say that, but anyway, there's a lot of holes in this thing. But one more, Senator - and this is one that does bother me probably more than anything else - even though I think your intent is right, and I think I understand what the intent is, there is a void, however, left, in my opinion, and all we can do is presume - all we can do is presume - that the current

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

riverboats do not have to go up for referendum. It does not state that in the bill explicitly that the current riverboats do not have to go through referendum. All it says — it says what happens in the case of the new licenses, but leaves void that which is with those — those older licenses. I have a lot more questions to this, but that's enough on the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Senator Philip, is it anything in this amendment that would bring the other -- the ten existing boats into the affirmative action Section that are placed in this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

As you know now, they have to have one now when they apply. When they -- what -- they reapply, they would have to do the same thing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

What I'm asking, I guess, is it any different in this amendment than current law? Did we change -- did you change anything in...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Shaw?

SENATOR SHAW:

Did you change anything in this amendment?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yeah. The -- the only thing different, it's the same as current law, although this says that you have to consider minorities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

The -- that's -- that's an interesting concept. On that one, when you consider them, and say that I made a bid -- this is done by bid, I take it? I made a bid. Now, you considered me. I met all of the criterias. There were ten of us who met -- minorities and women who met those criterias of the -- of the -- of this amendment. Would that information -- once the bid has been awarded, would -- under this amendment, would the information in terms of low bids and financial stability be made available in terms of -- I don't mean primarily the specific dollar amount -- would that be made available to the public or -- which group would be made available to the public the ones who got the bid, or the ones who did not get the bid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yes. I believe the -- the people who get the winning bid, the information would be made available.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

I notice it was the testimony of one of the gentlemen, and I didn't get a chance to ask him this morning in there. He was talking about fairness and opening up to the public, and I assume

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

that would be similar to opening the Senate up to the process here. Why not make all of that available, if we want to keep the public really informed, and — and put it all out there and let it — I believe that the Board would have great integrity. I — I don't have any problem with the Board, but it seems as though that long as they have nothing to hide, then they'd make it all available. Why don't we have that in this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, as you know, we have competitive bidding here, and if my memory serves me correctly, the -- it's not public knowledge. It's only the person who receives the contract or the bid. Quite frankly, you know, this is the first step. We all know if - if - it passes the Senate, gets in the House, it'll end up in a conference committee. I don't have any problem with that at all. But that's not the standards, I think, that we do now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. With regard to the language dealing with competitive bidding, I think it's a little unclear, and I would suggest that if it does go to a conference committee that it — it be straightened out. It says that the Board shall award the license to the applicant whose application and bid, in the opinion of the Board, shall result in the greatest amount of revenue, in the form of a wagering tax and the additional payments in accordance with the bid. I think it's unclear to me whether or not this is additional revenue that goes to the State exclusively, or whether it's additional revenue that can go to the city. So, for example, in the City of Chicago they've indicated that they wish to build an entertainment

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

complex, and they've told prospective applicants that they may have to come up with a hundred million dollars to help pay for this entertainment complex. Now, if they have to come up with a hundred million dollars to pay the local city, they're not going to be able to pay as much in the form of a tax. And if the -- way this language reads, if we're looking for the greatest amount of revenue for the State, then they're going to be at a competitive disadvantage. And since these ten new applicants are competing on a statewide basis, I think that it would work as a disadvantage actually to the -- to the city in their efforts to have what they view as a true economic development component of their riverboat license award process. So I just think it's something which is unclear, and it is something that ought to be cleared up if this bill does go to a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. I did file a fiscal note on this bill. Has -- it will remain on 2nd. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Upon the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2, Senator Jones, it is the intent of the Chair to move the bill to the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, isn't it according to the rules of this Body that if a fiscal note is filed, that that bill remain on 2nd, or are we making up rules as we go along?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yes. I will be happy to hold it on 3rd until we get the impact of this legislation. So we will not move it until we have

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

a financial idea of exactly what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR TONES:

Well, according to the rules, isn't it supposed to stay on 2nd Reading? I believe it's supposed to stay on 2nd Reading. Not 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones, the request for a fiscal note is out of order. This is not the house of origin of this bill. Thus, pursuant to the Fiscal Note Act, this request is out of order. Senator Jones, you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

SENATOR JONES:

I'm not trying to appeal the ruling of the Chair. All I'm -asking a simple question is that that fiscal note, which is proper
to be filed and has been filed -- it's not -- I'm not trying to
file it now. It's already filed. So since it is already filed,
and according to the rules, doesn't this bill remain on 2nd
Reading?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones, President Philip has informed the Chair that he would like to accommodate you when the bill is on 3rd Reading, but is -- it is the sponsor's intent to move this bill out of 2nd, adopt Floor Amendment No. 2, and place it on the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, you know, I heard what Senator Philip said, but what he said is totally incorrect. I know you have the Chair and so forth, and you want to -- but we should at least abide by the rules, because those same games that you play come back to haunt you at times. And so you are totally incorrect, Mr. President. So, to the bill now: I'd like to ask the -- the sponsor a

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

As it relate to -- as it relate to the ownership interest...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

I beg your -- I beg your pardon, Senator Jones, one second. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yeah. Well, I -- I don't think that request is in order until we adopt this amendment. It isn't even on the bill yet. So how can you make a request? It's not on -- we haven't adopted the amendment yet. After we adopt the amendment, that is -- is in order. And I told you I'd hold it on 3rd Reading until we got it. And you know it doesn't make a damn bit of difference anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, in response to the eloquent Senator from DuPage, I know damn well where the bill is, and I know where the -- when the amendment is filed. I asked a question of the Chair. The Chair could at least gave us an intelligent answer still -- instead of trying to make up a rule. I asked that for a particular reason. I know where the bill is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

And this is the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The -- Senator Jones, the Chair has made a ruling. Does the Senator wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

SENATOR JONES:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

I was not asking for a ruling. I asked for a response, and since you don't know, I'm not attempting to appeal the ruling of the Chair because just admit, "I do not know." And that'd been the appropriate answer to give. I'd like to question the sponsor of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Philip, on -- with respect to the ownership interest that reflect the diversity of the communities in which the applicant's proposed boat is to be docked, is the intent of that consideration to say that minorities could only own boats in the areas that -- that has a majority? Or let's say, I may want to own a boat in DuPage County. Under this language, my consideration would not be given as such. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

In awarding license, they want to take in consideration the diversity of that community.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Then again -- to take into consideration the diversity of the community. So therefore, if you are using standards as such, I assume we will use standards of the Gaming Board. Then if the diversity of the community is such that is very few minorities in there, then no consideration would be given to a minority applicant for licensing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is that a question, Senator? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

That is a question. I would like to have a response from the sponsor of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yeah. Incidentally, this is the same language that the Mayor has in his proposal, incidentally.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, I don't see the Mayor on the Floor, and I don't see his bill here, and I'm not speaking for him in this context. therefore, I'm asking you, the sponsor of this, because what it's saying to me is that you're trying to restrict any minority from owning a boat, only where they have a majority in a respective area. And I would think that this type of language in the bill is wrong. And I don't know where you got it from, but I don't any bill of the Mayor's here on the Senate Floor. So I don't think this is your real intent, but it's written into the law as So you say it shall consider. So therefore, if I or any other group that wanted to have a boat that does not reflect diversity of that community, then more than likely they would not be afforded the license. And I think that is terribly wrong. Another aspect of the bill, as it relate to the bidding process. The -- the bidding process - one would have to show where they would give the most to the State in a bid -- whoever win the highest bid. They've never had a license before. So therefore, how can one even give a certain percentage of that gross guarantee when they, in turn, will not know how much money they will make? That -- they may decide to give an additional twenty percent. That additional twenty percent may bankrupt that particular license application. So how can one do that?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, under the present law, they are required to do that right now - what they think they're going to make.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

No -- oh, you're talking about a bidding process, and that is not current law. We are not -- you're talking about a bid, and this will be awarded to the one who gives the highest bid. So therefore -- so -- so therefore, if you have -- according to this law, which is true, if applications are made and -- and that bid dollar goes into the General Revenue Fund, all ten new license applications could conceivably go to those areas who had the highest bid. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I guess that's probably accurate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, again, this -- you and I have talked on this piece of legislation, and I know you and your staff and -- and others put a lot of work into that, but as I indicated to you, that there is a hundred and seventy-seven Members of the General Assembly. And if we are sincere about expanding gaming opportunity to all sectors of the State and affording everyone the opportunity, then we would be more inclusive with all the Members on this side of the aisle, as well as the House. So this is a one-sided, partisan issue, but the issue as it relate to minority ownership with no standards in

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

here, because the Gaming Board don't even have to consider what you have in this bill. And we have -- my lawyers on this side have been working on language to comply with the recent Supreme Court decision in Richmond that would set forth a criteria to afford everyone the opportunity to own license, not only in areas where there are minorities, but throughout the State of Illinois. And the way you have this drafted, you want to restrict those individuals to the opportunity only in the area of City of Chicago, and I don't think that is your intent. And I urge that -- when a vote is taken, that this -- this amendment be defeated. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jones, for your information, the Chair's ruling was based upon statutory law 25 ILCS 50/1. Any further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, if I can attempt to answer Senator Jones. If you will look on page 15, (g-1), it says, quote, "Upon the termination, expiration or revocation of any owners license under this Act, the Board shall," - shall - "in making suitable <sic> (suitability) determinations prior to awarding the license for a 10-year period, consider" - in other words, they have to - "consider whether the current license <sic> (licensee) has in place appropriate affirmative action plans and minority and female business enterprise plans and whether the current licensee has honored any commitments made by it to the unit of local government designated as the licensee's home dock."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JONES:

A dual response. Number one, I did not ask you for a specific

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

ruling. I already know what the rules are. So -- as it relate to an amendment and a fiscal note being filed. I already know that. I just want you to give it to me from the Chair. Now, number two, as response to Senator Geo-Karis, as she said, "shall consider". With no standards, Senator - and I co-chaired the JCAR Committee for a number of years - with no standards as set forth in the criteria, with no predicate finding as it relate to minorities who have been discriminated, these -- these words are totally meaningless.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

If I may respond, Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

The language is "shall". It doesn't say "may consider". It says "shall consider" and does cover affirmative action and minority and female business enterprises.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I rise in support of Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2150. And I think that what we want to not lose track of here - the main point of the competitive bidding is that the State attempt, for the first time, to realize for the State and for the taxpayers of our State, the actual market value of the State licenses of these State assets that we have been giving out. Right now, to get a license that is worth anywhere from maybe two hundred million to a billion dollars, or maybe more, all you have to do is pay the State eighty-five thousand dollars in total fees. What this bill

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

attempts to do is to ask the people to bid a percentage of their adjusted gross receipts that they will pay the State over the length of their license - it stretches the license term to ten years - and in this way we can ask the people who are fortunate enough to get a license if they will return some of that to And it's only fair. They are getting a limited-monopoly State. There are only -- there would only be twenty riverboats license. in this State, and they would have a license to operate that. They would be paying a market rate to get the license. Now I just want to give you an idea. We have a good idea of what some of these licenses are worth. The Argacy Gaming Company, which owns the Alton Belle Riverboat in Alton, Illinois - it is a publicly are listed on the NASDAQ traded company. Its shares over-the-counter market. As of the close of business a few ago on May 16th, the total market value of that company was four hundred and thirty-seven million dollars. Now the boat and all the equipment only cost maybe thirty million dollars. the boat that's worth the four hundred million dollars. It's that license and the stream of revenue that that represents. There are very few other assets that this company has. What we're trying to do is capture that market value for the State, for the taxpayers. It should mean more revenue for this State - and we need the revenue - and it will still allow for generous returns for the And one other thing. I have taken the income statement of the boat -- one of the boats in Joliet - the Empress Riverboat - and I've put it on a spreadsheet. And we know that the return on equity right now with the existing gaming twenty percent for these owners is a hundred and fifty-two They made seventy-four million dollars in net percent. In their first eighteen months, they dividended to their nine shareholders eighty-seven million one hundred thousand dollars. That is almost as much as our largest manufacturing 122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

employer in the State - Caterpillar - dividended in that period to its tens of thousands of shareholders. Now, if that riverboat, the Empress, were to give thirty percent of its adjusted gaming receipts to this State, it would still have a hundred and seventeen percent return on equity. We can go on. If we went up to fifty percent of its gaming receipts going State and local municipality, it would still have a forty-eight percent return on equity. This makes sense. It's good public policy for the State. And lastly, it takes the whole -- it catapults the whole process of selecting boat owners out into the It restores public trust, because they will know it's not going to insiders; it's not going to the favorites of politicians. It -- it would be going to that entity which ends up paying the State and the community the most, and everything would be aboveboard. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Just real quick, 'cause it -- it's one of these things that -- figures don't lie, but liars sometime figure. Let me just tell you something, and I think that the Senator should be a little more direct in his response whenever he doesn't tell you the whole truth about the dividends, because it's my understanding that the greatest majority of the dividends that were expended were also put back into the company for more expansion on the ground. And I think that should be pointed out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

SENATOR MOLARO:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Real quickly, a small question first. It talks about increased purses for horsemen, or more money in purses for the -- the horse people. Where -- where would that money come from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

We are shifting OBT <sic> (OTB) moneys - I think seventeen million - putting that money -- as you know, when we -- when we allowed off-track betting, we took the money away from the breeders. We are giving that money back. That was the -- the original agreement. It's some seventeen million. And we're adding 4.8 million from, I believe, the tobacco tax. So they would have that increase.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Yes. Another -- another question. I assume in this bill - and we just got it; it's very lengthy - there are no guarantees in the bill. There is no written guarantee of how many licenses the City of Chicago would be able to get.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

That is absolutely correct. Chicago could end up with all ten of them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Possibly they could wind up with none.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Let -- let me say this: If you were an investor and -- and wanted to put a boat in, you'd want to put it in a place that would attract a lot of people and have a lot of population. In my -- and there is no way that Chicago isn't going to end up with boats. I wouldn't be surprised if they ended up with more than five boats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Another question. Would -- is there any prohibition in the bill, or current law, or have you changed current law, that prohibits a city such as Chicago or any municipality, or division of county government or township government, or another entity such as a State-created pension fund, from becoming an owner of a license or the owner of a boat?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I suppose they could submit an application like anybody else. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR MOLARO:

So they would not be prohibited from becoming owners under your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Under your proposal, if I remember correctly, you -- you allowed Chicago to own their owns boats, right? Yeah, I'm not sure I agree with that philosophy, under any stretch of the imagination. I think the post office is a perfect example on why we shouldn't let Chicago or anybody else operate boats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Well then, quickly to the -- to the amendment, and in response to that. The proposal that was kept in Rules - and I tried to get it out today - didn't talk about the City running anything. postal authority, if you bring that up, is run by the Postal Authority. The City of Chicago would not run a boat. My thinking would be - and you could look at the figures stated by Senator Fitzgerald - that there are -- are currently estimates that if the City of Chicago would get four or five boats - and by your own words, they could get all ten if you're going to build them in Chicago - with five boats they're talking about two billion dollars a year in gross revenues. Two billion. So my thinking would be, that you don't have the City run them. That would be crazy. I agree a hundred percent. You can't have City employees doing it. What you would do is you would get operators to bid on operating. So we could get the Empress people, or Harrah's, or the Casino -- Caesar's Palace. They would come in and run it. You wouldn't have anybody from the City of Chicago running anywhere near it. What you would have the City of Chicago do and

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

the State of Illinois -- and now would be a perfect time to do it, because you're not changing the rules for current owners. Now would be a perfect time, that instead of coming up and saying we're going to take bids from five or ten different groups of people and make ten instant billionaires by awarding these you're still going to have a State-run monopoly or State-forced monopoly - you're only going to have twenty licenses throughout the State of Illinois. That's like saying you're only going to have twenty liquor stores. It's going to be impossible for twenty twenty boats to lose money. Yeah, if you're going to have a hundred, or two hundred, or four hundred, or twenty years from now, but right now it would be impossible. And I can't figure out for the life of me why we would have and award ten contracts to private ownership when you have two hundred or two billion dollars at stake. So even if it costs fifty/sixty percent to run them, you're going to have eight hundred million dollars being cut up by ten groups of people, not even coming up with minority participation, whether it be blacks, or women, Hispanics. You're not talking about blacks or women, or Hispanics participating. You're talking about three or four blacks becoming instant billionaires, where their great-grandchildren won't This isn't going to go back to the people of -- the taxpayers of Illinois. You're not going to have it where we're going to go there and our constituencies are going to lose their money, and it's going to go back to the tax base. If there's in gambling that's here to stay, why not have it where if people are out there losing their hard-earned money, at least let the tax entity get the profit from it. Why should the gross revenues of an industry that's tantamount to a monopoly private ownership, and the only people who can bid on it are people who have millions and millions of dollars behind it? Ιt just doesn't make any sense.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Very briefly, there are some things in -- in here that I -- I like, and there are some that -- I believe need to be worked on. That's why I would like to see the bill -- if it was kept on 2nd, I could put some of the amendments that I put on the other bill, on this bill. instance, there should be something in here about compulsive gamblers, to give people who have a problem with gambling an opportunity to get some help. Also, in the -- prior to this, we introduced some legislation for affirmative action that would increase the goals to forty percent for minorities and twenty percent for women, and that should be in here. Lastly, referendum is good enough for the rest of the State, a referendum is most certainly good enough for the people of the City of Chicago, because the people of the City of Chicago should also have the right to vote to see if the people of the City of Chicago wants gambling in our City. Lastly, there should also entry fee in here that would go to police, directly to -- for community policing, because everyone knows that bringing all of this gambling to our State is going to cause an increase in crime, and we should have some revenues set aside specifically for law enforcement to deal with that problem. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I wanted to address a few items that I don't think have been addressed in the debate so far. I'm a little surprised and really taken aback, based upon the representations of our purposes of new Rules of the Senate that we — that we adopted last year. It

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

appears that what we have here is substantially different subjects all in one amendment that's offered to us the day before final reading of House bills. That sounds to me completely contrary to the representations that were made when the new rules were What I mean by that is this: This is a bill that deals with riverboats. At the same time, it deals with a subject would suggest to you has nothing to do with riverboats. It deals with the issues of product liability, negligence claims, compensation - issues that are totally irrelevant to the issue of riverboats. And I would suggest that if we were going to address subjects in single bills with, hopefully, related subject matters, these things should have been split out in two, or three, or four different bills. But that's not the essence of my objections. Let me tell you what some of these provisions do, and I will call them not "tort reform", because that's a misnomer, and I'm being by using that phrase. This is anti-consumer legislation to the hilt. There is a provision in this bill noneconomic damages to two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. That means that emotional distress, pain and suffering, loss of of companionship - regardless of the facts of the injury, the negligence involved that gave rise to this relationship of loss - the maximum of noneconomic damage is two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now let me give you an example of what that means. You are age twenty-five years of age. You are married. Your spouse is driving your family car, and some drunk runs a red light, crashes into your spouse's car and kills her. You would have had perhaps fifty years of a wonderful relationship with your wife - fifty years of love and companionship, and mutual support. Fifty years. You know what you're going to get paid for that -- that drunk that ran that light and slammed into your spouse and killed her, or him? Five thousand dollars a year. that what your spouse is worth, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the loss

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

of consortium, the loss of companionship, the pain and suffering that you have suffered by the death of your spouse? That's what's in this bill. If that's not anti-consumer, I don't know what is. There's a provision in this bill that says Example number two: that every product liability claim must now be proven by clear and convincing evidence. Existing law in this State forever has been preponderance of evidence. That means it is more true than not true that the defendant was negligent. I go down the street; pick up a bottle of soda. I drink that bottle of soda, and my insides start to hurt me immeasurably, and it turns out that maker of that soda didn't -- wasn't careful, and there's poison in there, for some reason that the manufacturer should have watched. I've got to prove that fact not by that it's more true than not true, but now by clear and convincing evidence. It's going to cost that consumer substantial money to bring in the kind of experts. We're talking about a -- instead of a fifty-one-percent perhaps a two-thirds proof, sixty-seven-percent proof. Is that consumerism? Is that a -- a recognition of people that have hurt, not by their action, but by the action of people that sell us products? This is a sap to big business. This is a sap to the people that sell us goods. This is a sap to the drunken drivers of the world. And this is in the riverboat gambling bill. on us, for even allowing this to be presented in this package. Ladies and Gentlemen, for all your voters - all your voters - your consumers -- you are hurting them immeasurably. And let me just tell you from an economic point of view, these things have been adopted in other states. There isn't one state - there isn't one state - that can show you a reduction in premiums reduction in lawsuits, as a result of this. Not one. I'll let the sponsor explain that on his closing. But here? anybody that votes Yes on this bill should be ashamed of themselves at election time, when you go back to your voters and

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

tell them that you're here to protect their interests. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor please identify why we have taken away the 4.8 million dollars that goes to McCormick Place? I assume it has nothing to do with the fact that Jim Reilly is no longer the executive director. But could you please explain why the 4.8 million that, by State law today, is a continuum for McCormick Place, for its operations, and to pay off the bonds and to pay its operations - why we are now taking it away with no replacement and giving it to the tracks for purse? Are we taking away from the DuPage Civic Center? Are we away from civic centers anywhere else, or any other auditoriums? Only from McCormick Place we are taking 4.8 million dollars to put it in the purse. That money was originally created for original McCormick Place for the bonds and for the operations to keep a world-class facility to bring conventions in, for nine billion dollars of economic development, and now we are destroying it for no apparent reason and no replacement. If the sponsor can explain why, I'd appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, I think one thing, the McCormick Place is doing extremely well. As you know, the State has subsidized Navy Pier -

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

the improvement of Navy Pier - and we 've also, I think, if I remember correctly, since I've been here had two or three expansions on McCormick Place. And so, I think we've treated them more than fairly, very honestly, and they're doing very well, I've been told.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think that President Philip may be slightly in error why we have spent this money, and in fact, it is this money that has allowed McCormick Place to continue and to be the showcase and to attract business, and to attract people hotels, and hopefully to riverboats, and to racetracks. The absence of this money means they will not stay in business. There's nothing to indicate that they are making a profit. fact, it is these tax resources that have allowed them to operate and to be this world-class attraction. To take this money away for no apparent reason, to give it to horse racing purses, seems absolutely ludicrous, and I don't think there's been any adequate explanation of why this is going to cease. It was created by law to keep them going, to be economic development, and now we're trying to destroy one of the best economic development advantages Illinois has had. One of the reasons, we are told, even for riverboat, is to keep conventions coming to Illinois. not even going to have a place for those conventions to go. And I think this is just a ridiculous way to be going.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

WCIA-Channel 3 has requested permission to record the proceedings. If no objection is noted, leave is granted. Any further discussion? Senator LaPaille.

SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. On the bill: To echo Senator

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Berman's points with regard to tort reform, medical caps, workers' compensation - the road that we're embarking on here is a dangerous one, because we do have a Chamber on the other side that minority here that is ic Democratic. We have а last well-organized and -- and very tough-minded, as you saw And if we were to begin to link apples and oranges, as you're attempting to do, just think of some of the scenarios Democrats in the House, or Democrats on this side of the aisle can We could say, "We're not going to pass a budget begin to link. until we get an increase in the minimum wage here in Illinois. We're not going to pass initiatives for the Governor or maybe his budget or other items, unless we have an increase in prevailing wage, or maybe more collective bargaining rights for workers in Illinois." And then maybe we would say, "We're going to hold out and we're going to take some business tax incentives away, because we don't think that exemption on machinery is working that well. And by God, we're going to just hold out until And you'll say, "Well, that -- that doesn't compare. The State budget doesn't compare to what you want." exactly what's happening here. Several weeks ago the Mayor and the Governor came up to an agreement that there should riverboats in the City of Chicago. Governor Edgar didn't mention anything about worker comp, tort reform, business development, cetera, or whatever you call all these measures. He just said, "Yes, it's time to have riverboats in Chicago." But we have take a look at this Governor, because of a year and a half ago, he said there should be a third airport. No third airport. He said it. Didn't provide any votes for it. Several months ago he there should be a ban on assault weapons. No ban on assault weapons - at least from the State of Illinois. And several weeks ago, he said there should be riverboats. So when it comes to this Governor and the City of Chicago, as brother Hendon would say,

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

"This Governor, when it comes to Chicago, walks the walk, talks the talk, but then he provides no leadership to get things done for the City of Chicago."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, you know, I don't know if I would have said that, I got to tell you, you know, there's been a -- a lot of talk here, but this is the first proposal advanced by either by a Member of either party, to, in fact, accomplish what's been requested. You know, talk is cheap, man. You know? You can go ahead -- all this rhetoric. Hey, guys, where's the beef? The other Chamber has a far greater majority than we have. Have they -- have they put a bill in? Have they tried to pass Senator LaPaille, you know that Chamber better than we do. How come they haven't done it? And I got to tell you, let's talk about intentions and objectivity. This amendment, offered by Senator Philip, is by far the cheapest price that would ever be paid for riverboats for Chicago. And it ought to be looked at, because I got to tell you, if you take any other route, the vaults aren't big enough, or full enough, to empty them out to pass that Why does the Speaker not attempt to pass a bill? You know Because that Chamber wishes to put its own interests above those of the City of Chicago and the riverboats they so You know, I got to tell you, I would be very much demand. ashamed, Senator Berman, to turn around and say - and you're a real advocate for education - that I am willing to turn around and scuttle all of this, 'cause I don't like one thing in here. I But you know what? You didn't put anything in don't like the cap. I haven't seen a bill you've submitted. I haven't seen a bill submitted by the other side. You talk about the Chicago bill. Did you put the Chicago bill in? Nobody did anything.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

is cheap, fellow Americans. Senator Philip has put himself -- and if you think this is an easy thing to do in our caucus, I got to tell you something, pal: This ain't too easy. But he took the bull by the horns, stuck his neck out, came up with a proposal, and now you're going to say, "I don't like that proposal." Well, you know what? Fine. But if you don't like it, give us one that you might like. But don't turn around and blow smoke. Don't turn around and pooh-pooh something, when you don't have anything better at all. You know, I sat at a dinner not too long ago, with a Chicago Democrat - no, take it back - suburban Chicago Democrat, with a largely Chicago area, as well - House Member. I said, you think riverboats are going to pass?" "Oh yeah, they're going to pass, in the House." I said, "Really?" I said, "How do you think that's going to do it?" He said, "Well, if I don't get one for my area, I'm not voting for it." Here is a Leader in House - Democrat - who's affected by the City of Chicago, and he has to have a riverboat before he'll vote Yes. Now can you imagine what somebody who is not from Chicago, who is not a Democrat, and who's a downstater is going to want? This proposal that -- is ultimately reasonable in terms -- in terms of the costs. ultimately reasonable because it addresses the issue of economic development. It's very reasonable because it, in fact, offers Chicago an opportunity to get what they want. And you guys are going to sit there and go, "Well, you know, I don't like this cap. I don't like this." I'll -- you know, I'll tell you something. I don't like some stuff that's in this bill. I really don't either. But I'm going to tell you, when you deal with issues of public policy of this sort, you better sit there and look at the whole Because in the end, when you're going to be judged, you can turn around and defend your vote on this, but don't rope around Senator Philip or this side, 'cause we are trying to do a job. And you better look to yourselves for the solution.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

And if you don't have anything better, then I suggest you do two things: Put your money where your mouth is, or just shut up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

If there's no further discussion, Senator Philip, to close. SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. just say this: We all know this is the first step in a long, drawn-out process. If - if - this finally passes Senate, goes over to the House, you know what the end results are. will end up in a conference committee, and we will add some things and subtract some things. Now if you think this is the final product, you are -- you are sadly, sadly mistaken. But it is a step in the right direction. It helps the City of Chicago, and it helps the entire State of Illinois. And I'll remind you, in 1974, we elected a Democrat Governor, a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate for the first time in about twenty or thirty years. And what -- what did the other side of the aisle do? Pass the largest increase in workmen's compensation in the history of the State of Illinois. Out of fifty states, Illinois was Now we have chipped that down a little bit, but we're still in the top ten states. And very honestly, we are not competitive with the Midwest - with Ohio, Michigan, Indiana. I'll tell you a During my last campaign, I stopped to buy coffee for some construction workers, on -- on -- on one of the highways. We started talking. I bought them all coffee. I said, "I'd to have my picture taken with you, gentlemen, for one of my brochures." They said, "Sure." There were, I think, eight or ten there. All of them were from where? Indiana. Indiana. They commuted every day, over here into Illinois, to work on Why? Workmen's constructions for one of our highways. It's the number one reason people don't expand in Compensation. Illinois or don't come to Illinois, and it's about time we did

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

something about it. And how did Cook County and Chicago get in They did it to themselves. this hole they're in? Ιf remember, the State's attorney, and the Mayor - Mayor Sawyer, State's Attorney Daley - thought it was a bad idea. It would bring in some criminal element. We don't want it. And what happened? They were removed from the bill, at their request. Now, they certainly had an opportunity to change their mind. changed my mind more than I'd like to admit. And they have changed their mind. And, quite frankly, they're entitled to just like the other hundred and one counties in Illinois are. This is a step in the right direction - the first step. For a change, do what's right and vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Philip moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2150. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 30 Ayes, 20 <sic> (28) Nays, 1 voting Present. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. Before we leave the page, leave has been requested, and granted, by Senator Demuzio, to return to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 1391. Senator Demuzio, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Demuzio seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1391 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1391. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Smith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment to add to House Bill 1391 merely adds a provision which amends the Department of Public Health Act, and the Civil Administration <sic> Code to require the public -- Department of Public Health to establish an Osteoporosis Prevention and Education Program. It came out 10 to nothing in the committee, and I ask for this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Smith has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1391. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, just an update. It's the intent of the Chair to proceed through the end of the Calendar, but only to take up those bills that are on -- on recall - in other words, those bills that are -- are to be amended - so that -- that we can move into -- to the Senate Appropriations Committee meeting this evening. We've got an agenda there we have to deal with, and so that's what we will do for the remainder of the afternoon. All right. On -- on page 6 is House Bill 2221. Senator Jacobs. Senator Jacobs seeks leave of the Body to return

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

House Bill 2221 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On that Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2221. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, by Senator Rea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Amendment 1 is an -- a committee-agreed amendment that came out of committee 10 to zero, and it requires the Department of Public Health to create a program to improve the supply and distribution of health care professionals through service-education linkages in medically underserved areas, which is certainly a -- a real need in -- in rural Illinois. And this is a part of the Rural Health Initiative, and would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah. Not to the amendment, Mr. President, but in the last debate, there was a -- a -- a rhetorical reference that I made, and I hope that -- there was no personal insult given or animosity intended, whenever I used the rhetorical comment that I did. And if Senator Fitzgerald may have thought that I might have impugned him, I would apologize publicly, because that was not my intent. It was just a rhetorical reference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Thank you. Senator Rea has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2221. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. -- Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Collins. I'm sorry. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

No problem, Mr. President. Yes, Mr. President, Amendment No. 2 is a provision which amends the Alcoholism and other Drug <sic> Dependency Act to permit DASA, contingent upon appropriations and upon a conclusion by the Department that statutory impediments do not exist, to create a pilot program to evaluate the use of acupuncture in the detoxification and treatment of substance abusers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Trotter has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2221. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. House Bill 2424. Senator Cronin. Senator Cronin? Senator Cronin seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2424 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2424. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 2424 adds language which amends the Instruments Regarding Adopted Children Act, which is intended to ensure that adopted children are considered natural children of the adoptive parent for purposes of determining property rights. Most specifically, the -- the bill says that "the use of the term 'child'," or "'grandchild', 'heir', 'descendent', 'issue', 'per stirpes', or 'by right of representation' does not demonstrate an intention to exclude an adopted child under the terms of the instrument." I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Cronin has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 2424. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3278. Senator Donahue. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Senator Donahue seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3278 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3278. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SECRETARY HARRY:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. We've heard this bill before on the Senate Floor. It passed 56 to nothing. And this bill would provide that no AFDC mother under the age of seventeen, who's never been married, shall received an AFDC grant payment unless they live with their parent, guardian or adult relative, or live in a foster home. There are three exceptions: if the mother's parents or guardian are dead, or their whereabouts are unknown; if the Department of Public Aid determines that the physical health and safety of the mother or child would be jeopardized; and the final one is if the mother has lived apart from her parents or guardian for at least one year prior to the birth of her child. The idea here and the concept is one in which we are trying to create a support network for children having We have a situation in this -- we have a situation in children. this State and country in which young teenage mothers having children, leaving home and really need that family support unit and network. And that's what this is an effort to do - to provide that. And I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there discussion? Senator Collins. SENATOR COLLINS:

Ouestion of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator -- Senator Watson, can you clarify something for me? What happens in -- in the case where the girl gets pregnant, goes home and tell the mother that she's pregnant, and the mother puts her out. That's not a year; that wouldn't give her a year -- she wouldn't qualify. Are there exemptions made for those kind of cases?

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, Senator, there are. I appreciate that question. The Department of Public Aid has that prerogative.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further -- Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator -- Senator -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, the noise level is too high. I couldn't hear his answer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson, would you respond, please?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. First of all, if -- if the young lady is pregnant, this only applies if, in fact, the child is born. Secondly, yes, there are exemptions and the Department of Public Aid can make that determination if the -- what she would -- what the Department would feel is the physical health and safety of the mother, or the child, for that matter, is jeopardized, they can make that exception.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close, sir? Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. -- Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Burzynski.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Again, this is another provision that has already passed from this Chamber. It's been debated quite heavily on the Senate Floor, as well as in committee. Amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. Deletes provisions concerning written agreements with -- between the Illinois Department of Public Aid and the Department of Corrections concerning the prerelease application and expeditious processing request for benefits filed by or on behalf of persons scheduled for release. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Burzynski has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, by Senator Burzynski.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is a bill that received unanimous approval in committee today, and basically we're talking about -- provides that no AFDC grant payment shall be made on behalf of minor under age eighteen who has never married and has a child, unless the minor resides with -- excuse me, wrong one. This is the teenage literacy bill. And I would be more than willing to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Burzynski has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 5, by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. This particular amendment was -- is identical to Senate Bill 1525, which passed the Senate 37 to 21. This says that if an individual is enrolled in AFDC and they have an additional child while they are enrolled, their grant payment does not go up. They can be enrolled in AFDC, and they will get the payments that they deserve, based on their family when they enroll. But if they have an additional child, their -- their grant does not go up. This does not impact food stamps. They will get the additional money for food stamps, so that's not impacted. Medicaid is not impacted. So the health care that's available through the Medicaid system would certainly be available to this child. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Ladies and Gentlemen, it -- it is getting late and everyone's tired. We don't have much more to go. Let's -- let's keep the noise to a lull, if we could, please. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. And, Senator, I understand fully what you're trying to do here, and I've had a lot of mail on this issue, and I -- and I understand exactly what you're trying to do. My only problem I have with this amendment is when we try to do things such as this as to limit the number of children people can have, or -- or to pay for them or whatever, I run into the problem that these children are the ones that are being left out in the cold. I'm

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

not worried about the parent. I'm with you on that, and I understand that. But sometimes, you know, you have to take into consideration that -- especially, I know, in your case, being a strong pro-lifer, that you have to ensure that these people don't abort, according to your beliefs. And so when they have these children, then someone has to take care of them. And it's not lot of money that that extra child may -- may bring to the family, but it does take more money. As a father of six, I know how much money it takes to raise extra children. And I just think that the intent of this is right, and I don't disagree with the intent, I just wanted to -- to stand and -- and let it be known that -- that I have some problems, because I think the wrong person is being hit here. And that's a problem that I have with this particular amendment. If we could figure out some other way of doing it - I don't know what it is - but I do -- I do at least give you credit for trying to address the problem. I'm not sure if we're going in the right direction with this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Watson, if you intend by this bill to limit the number of children that women receiving AFDC would have, does that mean by implication that you support the options to pregnancy, including abortion?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Then what you're saying in practice is that you want to limit the resources, but you're not willing to provide some means by which women can make a choice about being pregnant. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No. I -- I think the whole line of questioning here is a little ridiculous. I -- all we're wanting to do here is ask for people to be responsible for their actions. That's all we're saying. And I'm telling you, if you're in -- if you are in welfare and AFDC and you have an additional child, to my way of thinking, that is not a responsible action. And if that's what you want to do, then I think you should be held accountable and responsible for that, and that's to take care of that child, and not necessarily the taxpayers of this State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you again, Mr. President. Just -- I do not appreciate the remark that this is foolish discussion, because if we do not discuss the options that women have to having children, then we have closed all the avenues. And there is something contradictory in the logic not to allow for some options to pregnancy, if the intention is to limit the number of children that a -- a woman has. And she should have that choice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close? SENATOR WATSON:

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Well. thank you. I -- I maybe did misspeak there, apologize for -- for that remark. But I do feel very strongly about this issue. And -- and, Senator Jacobs, I've gotten a lot of mail as a result of this issue also. I've gotten a lot of mail from Public Aid caseworkers. And I don't know if you've talked to some of these people, but they are in -- in huge support of this, because they do see and sense the abuse of what's going on. Minutes had a program just last Sunday, and it was informative as to what has happened in New Jersey. And this is sort of a -- a pilot -- or New Jersey was the first state really went after this particular issue. And if you remember when we debated this on the Floor before, New Jersey, in October, November and December of 1993, has seen a considerable reduction, and progressive reduction, in the number of individuals that have filed for -- for public aid, compared to the year before. So -- in New Jersey, and what they -- they talked about on 60 Minutes, this is working. And I just think, again, it's asking people to be responsible for their actions, Mr. President, and I would appreciate its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for -- for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Donahue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment is two parts. The first part deals

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

primarily with OBRA legislation from the federal level, in regard to child support and mandated programs that we must adopt at the State level. And the second part deals with people that are representing the State in child support cases; that the State is in fact the client, and a client-attorney relationship does exist. And I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Donahue has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 6 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes — the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 7, offered by Senator Tom Dunn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Tom Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is also an amendment that's passed previously. It's a -- calls for a five-year demonstration project in two counties, to limit the welfare to two years and for individuals to work with their case-management people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Dunn has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 3278. Those in favor, vote Aye -- say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you arise,

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

sir?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

...(machine cutoff)...President, if I -- if I might make some inquiry as to what the order of our business is going to be here. You indicated that we're going to go through the rest of the Calendar, and handle those bills that have amendments, and then we're going to go off to Appropriations. Now, you weren't inferring that we were finished at that particular stage of the game. There's some rumor around here that we are coming back after that -- after that meeting. So could you give us some guidance? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Demuzio, we will -- when we -- when we finish one or two more bills here that are on recall, we will adjourn for this evening. We will then, you and I and others, will head down to Appropriations. House Bill 3485. Senator Burzynski. All right. All right. House Bill 3582. Senator Butler. Senator Butler seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3582 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of tabling an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3582. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Butler moves to -- to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 3582 was adopted. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it -- and the... Senator Butler now moves that House Bill 3582 be tabled. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes -- I -- I -- I beg your pardon. Senator Butler has moved that Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3582 be tabled. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is tabled. Any further amendments, Mr.

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3611. Senator Sieben. Senator Sieben seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3611 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3611. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Donahue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3611 deals with an issue with bankers. Most of us have found that the banks in our communities are having difficulty getting directors to serve because of the civil liability and the personal liability of these directors. This language simply gives civil liability -- wait. Sorry, limits their civil liability -- personal liability in the bankers -- directors of our banks. I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Donahue has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3611. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Sieben.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Yes, Mr. President, I would like to withdraw Amendment No. 2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Sieben seeks leave to table Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3611. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, by Senator Sieben.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 3 permits the issuance of surety bonds in lieu of collateralization requirement for trust funds awaiting investment. I know of no opposition. I'd move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Sieben has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 3611. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen -- Senator Donahue, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just remind everyone that is on the Appropriations Committee, that we have a meeting in 212 immediately. The sooner we get down there, the sooner we can get

122nd Legislative Day

May 19, 1994

out. So, Appropriations, 212, right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Is there any further business to come before --Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Yes, thank you, Mr. President. We have a Education hearing meeting at Room 212. So that's Room 212, here in the Capitol, tomorrow at 8:30. We want to get out by 9 o'clock, because I understand that's when we're coming into Session. So, Education, 212, tomorrow, 8:30.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Any further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Dillard moves that the Senate stand adjourned -- I'm sorry. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President. For a -- a point of information, and -- and so everybody knows where we're going. And tomorrow we're in at 9 a.m. I hope that everybody would be on time. The -- the earlier we get started, the earlier we'll get out of here. As you know, the House have changed their rules once again - I think for the fifth or sixth times - I've lost track - and have extended their deadlines. It would appear that there's no reason for us to come back after we adjourn tomorrow till May 25th at 2 p.m, because they're not sending anything over. There's no joint action, so there's no sense in coming down here and wasting taxpayers' money. So we will come back on Wednesday, May 25th, at 2:00 p.m.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Dillard moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Friday, at the hour of 9 a.m., May 20th. Senate is adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS

88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

94/11/04

16:42:23

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 19, 1994

	1111 15, 1554		
HB-0044	RECALLED	PAGE	29
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	-
	RECALLED	PAGE	33
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	*
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	_
	SECOND READING	PAGE	21
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	50
	RECALLED	PAGE	51
	RECALLED	PAGE	_
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	65
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	73
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	_
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	RESOLUTION OFFERED		
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1480	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1481	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1482	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1483	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1484	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
HJR-0157	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
	SUBJECT MATTER		

SENATE TO ORDER-SENATOR WEAVER	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
RECESS	PAGE	1
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	1
PRAYER-THE REVEREND JEFF CHITWOOD	PAGE	1
JOURNAL-APPROVED	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-POSTPONED	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	3

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

94/11/04

16:42:23

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 19, 1994

SUBJECT MATTER

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE PAGE 4 COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE PAGE 6 AT EASE SENATE RECONVENES PAGE 6 PAGE 38 AT EASE SENATE RECONVENES PAGE 38 COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE 40 PAGE 120 ADJOURNMENT