68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Regular Session of the 89th General Assembly will come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer today will be given by the Reverend Lonnie E. <sic> (H.) Lee of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Springfield. Reverend Lee.

THE REVEREND LONNIE H. LEE:

(Prayer by the Reverend Lonnie H. Lee)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Sieben will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. SENATOR SIEBEN:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Wednesday, January 10th, in the year 1996, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Cronin, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports

Senate Bill 1239 Do Pass, as Amended, and Senate Bill 1240 Do

Pass.

And Senator Karpiel, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports House Bill 1523, the First Conference Committee Report, Be Approved for Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Resolutions. Introduction of Bills.

SECRETARY HARRY:

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Senate Bill 1269, offered by Senators Berman, Dunn and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1270, by Senator Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1271, offered by Senator Bowles.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1272, by Senator Klemm.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

...recognizes Senator Lauzen, for the introductions.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Ladies and Gentlemen, in less than a month from now, on February 2nd, we'll be sending one of our citizens to the Miss USA Contest in Texas. Before I present Miss Illinois, USA, Bernadette Przybycien, a few introductions. I'm also delighted today to introduce two of my constituents, Jo Anne and Tony Salerno. They're the producers of the Miss Illinois and Miss Teen Illinois They invited me to be on the judging panel, and I was impressed by their organization and with the respect that they treated each contestant. I'd also like to introduce Edna Walden, a special assistant to the -- in the Governor's Office. And then, we had Walter Dudycz here a little while ago, and you might have thought that Walter was up here to give his tips on charm and beauty, knowing what a charming, beautiful guy he is, Bernadette lives in Walt Dudycz's district. And also, leave anyone out, I wanted to introduce our resident charmer and beauty in Sara Knoles, who's with us also today. Sir Osler wrote: Nothing will sustain us more potently than the power to recognize in our routine the true poetry of life - the poetry of the commonplace, of the ordinary, with our sorrows and our griefs, our loves and our joys. Perhaps that's why there are

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

pageants of masculine and feminine, charm and beauty, Olympics and Super Bowls. Now, let me tell you a little bit about Bernadette Przybycien. She's a senior at Loyola University. She's studying psychiatric nursing, which makes it very appropriate here today. While she's a full-time student, she's also working full time as a —— as the supervisor of the Downtown Chicago Marriott Health Club. She enjoys here family, Polish heritage, sports, dancing, pizza and Forrest Gump. She describes herself, and I agree, as genuine, open-minded, independent, and she describes our great State of Illinois as friendly, entertaining and historical. May I present to you Miss Bernadette Przybycien, Miss Illinois, USA.

MISS ILLINOIS BERNADETTE PRZYBYCIEN:

(Remarks by Miss Illinois, Bernadette Przybycien)
SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Before we send Bernadette off to Texas to compete on our behalf in the Miss USA Pageant on February 2nd, I'd like to present her with a plaque of commemoration and recognition from the Senate and State of Illinois and then an Illinois Flag, on behalf of the State Senate and the people of Illinois.

MISS ILLINOIS BERNADETTE PRZYBYCIEN:

(Remarks by Miss Illinois, Bernadette Przybycien)
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Introduction of Bills.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1273, offered by Senator Klemm.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1274, offered by Senator Woodyard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1275, offered by Senator Woodyard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

lst Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

On the Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is Conference Committee Report. Mr. <sic> Secretary, do you have on file a conference committee report on House Bill 1523?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1523.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

For what purpose does Senator Jacobs arise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Mr. President, we would request a Democratic Caucus for about fifteen minutes, in Senator Jones' Office immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

That request is always in order. There'll be a Democratic Caucus in Senator Jones' Office. We will stand -- Senator... Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I, too, would request a Republican Caucus immediately in Pate Philip's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

There'll be a Republican Caucus in Senator Philip's Office.

The Senate will stand in recess until 11 o'clock.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Introduction of Bills.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1276, offered by Senator Clayborne.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Senate Bill 1277, offered by Senators Raica and Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

On Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is House Bill 1523. Mr. <sic>
Secretary, do you have a conference committee on file?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1523.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Madam President. We have before us Conference Committee Report to House Bill No. 1523. I will do my best to briefly introduce it. The Report becomes the bill. The bill, in effect, repeals the Retail Rate Law as it applies to solid waste And I might add that it does so in a very complete incinerators. and retroactive fashion. Briefly, to let you -- let the Body understand what the Retail Rate Law is, it grows on top of a federal law. Under federal law, public utilities are required to purchase electricity from -- from incinerator facilities at the avoided cost. The Illinois Retail Rate Law requires that public utilities purchase this electricity at the retail rate, and the public utility is then entitled to a tax credit against its public utilities tax. Once the incinerator facilities have repaid their original debt, they are supposed to reimburse the State for the reduction in tax revenues caused by the tax credit and to do so without interest. Unfortunately, the repayment provisions in the law are very weak, and it is questionable whether or not these facilities will be economically viable for long enough to repay this debt to the State. In essence and in the very best the State, under this law, is providing a no-interest loan to the incinerator developers with no guarantee that the money will ever

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

be repaid. The -- again, the Conference Committee Report is what's before us, and I stand prepared to answer any questions any Member of the Body may have. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the Senator yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, this bill is coming at us pretty quick. We all know that there's been discussion ongoing about the Retail Rate Law. There are many of us on this side of the aisle that would like to join with you in voting for a Retail Rate Law bill; however, I'm a little concerned with the speed of which this thing is going If you remember, in the -- the late hours of the Veto Session, we passed a eavesdropping provision in a bill that a lot of us did not even know that was there. The Governor mentioned it the other day in his speech that it needs to be modified. And I think it's a little foolhardy whenever we don't think these bills out in advance, and I would ask the sponsor to hold this bill until which time we can offer amendments and/or to get legislation which, in my mind, would clear the State of any financial responsibility and would not be in violation of any implied contract that we may have with these operators at this time. also, I'd like to give some further consideration to what we do with tires. We're very much aware that tires cannot go landfills. They can be mixed with some of the fuels used in coal burning, but I don't think that that's a market for it, and the shredding of -- of tires doesn't create a market. So I'm afraid that we're going to get all these tires in our backyards, on our

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

streets, et cetera, because we're going to have no way to really dispose of any quantity, and I would ask the sponsor if he would hold this bill until a later date, until we have the time to investigate it more and to offer some amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Jacobs, thank you for your comments. As -- as usual, they're well reasoned, and -- and I appreciate it. However, I think you know, as I do know, that there is probably no issue that this Body has debated much more than this particular one, for the three years that I've served in the Illinois Senate. So with all due respect to your request, I have to -- to let you know that I think the Body is pretty well familiar with the contents of the legislation. I do not intend to take it out of the record. I will, however, let you know that I'd be happy to go over each and every item of the bill to make sure that everybody understands what's in it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

And I understand that, and that's well within your -- your rights, Senator. Still then, I -- I must express my concern that this legislation, I think, puts the State in financial jeopardy. I think there's court cases, as I was informed this morning, there's four of them, which have held that the State can be held responsible in these cases. So I have concerns with that, as well as the fact that I don't think we're really going to stop anything of those that are already under construction. So it really becomes an issue that becomes a little bit moot, and I -- I must say, and I must add, that I think that this is as much a political issue as it is a issue of good government.

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator O'Malley, in the case where the bonds have already been issued in the local municipalities in the -- the development agencies -- entities, if we default on those bonds now, what will be the financial consequences to those villages and any -- we're talking about basically Robbins here, because they're about three-thirds, I think, on line with their incinerator and that they're going to continue, notwithstanding the repeal of this Act. What will be the economic consequences to that village, given the fact that -- that we will default on the bonds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Collins, I -- I -- you made similar comments in the committee today, and -- and I think I want to get them -- make sure we get them clarified away today. First of all, the State is not defaulting on anything. Additionally, as I understand it, the bonds in the case of the Village of Robbins were issued nonrecourse to the village. These are strictly a private investment by private enterprise. And as for the implications for the village, the developer even made comments in committee that, in effect, the -- the project would continue. I don't know. That was his statement in -- in committee. So, to -- to very succinctly bring it to closure, I appreciate your question and the opportunity to clarify it. There is no State exposure. The State is not obligated on those bonds. And as far as the Village of

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Robbins, I understand they are nonrecourse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

What about the -- the Illinois Finance Authority? Did not they issue the bonds for Ford Heights?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

That's another subject that came up in committee today, and the Senator to your -- your left clarified what -- what the status of those particular forms of debt are. But apparently, again, that's nonrecourse to the State as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

To the overall bill: I have no objections to repealing this Act, but this bill really is not about that. That is not motivation behind this bill. There's no doubt that if we had taken our times and not -- act from a political standpoint in 1987 when we jumped out there and -- and -- and implemented this law in the first place, rather than taking our times and EPA going out there and really assessing our landfill space, oh no, all of a sudden we were in serious trouble and we went out there - in terms of our landfill capacity - and we went out there and we provided this incentive for these people to go out there and start these incinerator plants. The Village of Robbins and some other communities saw this as an opportunity to save a dying community, and they went out there in good faith and they floated -- they -they found the developers and they floated these bonds. And let me tell you this: These bonds -- the people who are going to be financial impacted by these bonds are individuals, are little

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

people, senior citizens, people that have saved their money over the years through pension funds and other kinds of public funds, and they will be impacted if we default -- if -- if those villages and this developer default on these bonds. We can repeal the Retail Act without -- without destroying these communities. It is not going to stop the development of this plant. O'Malley, you know and I know that the only way that you could stop it - because you've been trying to stop the development out there, and maybe justifiably so, for your constituents, because to -- many of the constituents in the surrounding communities especially are afraid of the impact on the environment of this incinerator. As a good legislator - and I'm sure that that's your motivation - you're responding to the will of your constituency. However, it is your responsibility as a legislator to make sure that you protect the health, safety and welfare of all of the people of this State. While doing so, representing your people in your community. And I say that you have an opportunity to do that. With this bill, you can repeal this Act and you don't have to bankrupt Ford Heights and Robbin <sic> (Robbins) in the process. This bill could be amended. We could take our times. There's no rush to do this today. We're not on a deadline. We just started this Session. So why can't we just settle down, hold this bill, develop a -- a -- a -- a -- a bill that will repeal this Act, which we should, and at the same time, provide some financial relief to the people that's being impacted so that they will not lose their investment and you will not further bankrupt an entire community - two communities: Robbin <sic> and Ford Heights? think this is irresponsible and we have an obligation not to do this for political reasons.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Yes. Thank you very much, Madam President. I would like to ask Senator O'Malley some additional questions along the same lines that I -- I posed to him in committee. Senator O'Malley, if -- if I may, you indicate that there is no obligation of -- at all of the State of Illinois with respect to these bonds, either moral or full faith and credit. Under the Act establishing home rule powers, have we not granted to home rules the opportunity to issue bonds for the explicit purpose of -- of -- of this environmental project?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator, I do not know the answer to your question. It's my understanding that these are revenue bonds and they do not have the full faith and credit of the municipality behind them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, what I -- what I think is -- is important to -- to recognize today, that - and I learned this subsequent to my vote in committee - that there are eleven such projects that apparently had been certified by the Environmental Protection Agency as being eligible to -- apparently to issue bonds under -- under whatever Section for this purpose. What concerns me is, is that if there is a default, for example, in the area -- in the interest of Robbins of three hundred and eighty-five million dollars in total once they've fully extended, it would seem to me that if, in fact, they were to default, that the State would have an obligation not only to Robbins but also to all the other eleven projects that are -- that are currently on this list. And so what -- in fact, what we are -- what we have done is we have given unfettered authority to those communities, whether they be home rule or non-home rule, to

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

issue bonds, and whether they are full faith and credit or moral obligations of the State of Illinois, we would have, I would think, as a result of a court case, the obligation in every one of those defaults. So I -- I really have some really significant problems with what we are doing today. I think as a matter of public policy we ought to take this thing out of the record; that we ought to either grandfather in those projects that are -currently have been certified, particularly those projects that have been -- bonds have been issued, and then I think we ought start talking about whether or not we ought to cap the liability that is -- that is to the State of Illinois, whether, again, it be full faith and credit or whether it be moral. I think what we're embarking upon here is a tremendous departure from previous practices. I think it's pretty well open, and I think that we ought to really take this out of the record and really thoroughly discuss what we are about to do here, because things have changed since -- since I learned this morning more about this -- about this issue. And I -- I think that this is probably not the proper course for us to embark upon today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President. This is one of the most interesting bills we've had here because it reverses a policy of the State of Illinois that was put into the law by the environmental movement itself. What that policy is, is a policy that incinerating your waste is of a higher priority for the State of Illinois than putting it in a landfill. That was twenty years ago. And I think we should ask ourselves: Why did we come up with that theory? Why were the environmentalists in favor of incinerating garbage instead of putting it in a landfill? The reason is, number one, they thought, and they are right, that

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

garbage going into an incinerator can be clean enough so that spew forth hazardous waste. This article that was passed Senator Fitzgerald talks about out by incinerators cadmium, arsenic, dioxin, chromium, PCBs, lead, Certainly, if you throw batteries in there, it's going 'em. The thing we need to do is to make sure that the garbage going into the incinerator itself is clean. We can do that with a system that separates the garbage before it goes in. I've seen it done out in Rhode Island and out in Connecticut. It's done throughout the country. We can do it here in Illinois. We don't have to throw the baby out with the bathwater by shutting down the incinerator in Robbins. Secondly, what's going to happen if we do close down these incinerators? Well, the trash will go into landfills. Where are those landfills? They're all downstate. They're downstate. So any of you Republicans, including you who are up for election this year and are targeted, should not be voting to repeal this Retail Rate Law, because if you do, putting out a welcome mat for garbage from Chicago to come down to I'd also like to point out that this article that was passed out says that there are no monetary guarantees that these businesses will not walk away and leave the State of Illinois holding the bag. The incentives given to these incinerators repaid to the State of Illinois. It seems to me that we could fashion a proposal that requires a surety bond by each of these incinerators to make sure that that money is repaid. And finally, I think we have to consider the fact, whether we like not, that these incinerators create jobs. The AFL-CIO isn't opposing this bill for no reason at all. There aren't many available, folks. These are good-paying jobs, and we need them in the State of Illinois. Those are four good reasons to vote against this bill. We can make sure that these incinerators are All we have to do is require better inspections.

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

a few years ago, we passed a bill saying the EPA had to have an inspector up in the Chicago area to watch what goes on near Calumet City Landfill. We did that then. The EPA had somebody there. We can do that again with these incinerators. W۵ can require that a State official be there when the garbage is dumped, before it's incinerated, paid for by the incinerator company themselves, but being a State employee. That would guarantee safety of what goes into that incinerator. And finally, let me just say that many of us on this side agree that the Retail Law should be phased out, and we intend to come up with legislation that will do just that. Take care of those that are already there. I think we have an obligation under the law to do To do otherwise would be an ex post facto law that I think would be held unconstitutional by the courts. I think if we that, say we've done enough; we've done our share to build these incinerators; we're -- we've done our -- we've done enough to help with this bill; we've kept our word to the people who have built these incinerators, and let it go at that. So I would urge a No vote and wait for the better legislation that we are going to introduce in the next few weeks. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Madam President. Here we go again. We're here in Springfield, the Illinois General Assembly, the land where yes is no and no is yes; what appears is not necessarily what is. Here we have Republicans - Republicans - fighting to remove a big tax break for business, and we've got Democrats fighting to keep that big tax break in there. There are some questions, and there are some legitimate issues involved here. The subsidy issue is a big one versus private enterprise. Why can't private enterprise provide this type of mechanism to eliminate our waste? I believe,

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

and I think the facts are, that there will be litigation. The retroactivity, the default on the bonds - those are -- those are legitimate issues of concern to all citizens of the State of Illinois. Ultimately the questions are and should be: What are we going to do with all the garbage we've got, and is this process of incineration -- or can the process of incineration be no less harmful than disposing of wastes in landfills? I -- I rise announce my support for this measure, but I also call on the Governor to give us some input and some direction in resolving some of these issues, because I suspect this bill's going to fly out of here. But I do call on the Governor and I do ask that he give his -- exert his leadership when he has the opportunity to do so. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I heard the last speaker call upon the Governor. yesterday, I heard the Governor's call, and I think we ought to have an eraser. I believe the Governor is going to have to change the state of the State. Yesterday he said the issue Illinois is job creation. Yesterday he said the state of the State of Illinois was good. I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we do this, the answer to both of those questions is the opposite. We will be, in fact, not only losing some jobs some of you may say that's not important - but the state of State will now be no good because the word of the State will now be no good. That's the issue in the way this bill is presented. I, for one, will join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in crafting legislation to do away with the issue for the future. Maybe we should not have done it in the past. The issue is: do we correct that? Let us stop this type of subsidy in the

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

What is at stake is the integrity of Illinois. We have passed a law that gave a -- a basis for a bond issue that Illinois Finance Authority authorized and people bought. If the word of Illinois is no good, if we can turn around tomorrow change the tax base for any bond we have, be it McPier -- I mean, Jim Reilly might as well go back home, forget about anything wants to do in the future - and that may be fine with me too but there's no way you could ever convince anyone that anv basis for any issue we have done is safe while the General Assembly is in Session. Because we can now, we will be saying, turn around and say we are cutting the very basis out of the integrity of those issues that were based on law created by Members of this Body, the Chamber across the way, and the Second The Second Floor's word will be no good. The Third Floor's word will be no good. Why would any business come to Illinois on a promise of some form of economic development now say we're destroying that? And let's look at who gets hurt. Who gets hurt by doing this? Not the industry, from what I'm hearing from the testimony, but the people who bought the bonds. And who are they? State Employees' Retirement System, the Deferred Comp. System, all of these mutual funds that are owned by retirees or near-retirees who are depending upon this income for These were tax-exempt bonds bought by their livelihood. kind of funds. The hit will be taken by the retirees, the near-retirees. They're the ones who are going to suffer the these bonds are defaulted. There will be an almost when four-hundred-million-dollar loss to people who in good believed Illinois and said that there would be a basis for paying off these bonds. I predict to you that Illinois' General Obligation Bond rating will also suffer in the future. bond rating agencies over the years on behalf of Illinois issues. These ratings are based on risk. Why would

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

anybody recommend an Illinois bond in the future, when there's an added risk because of what this General Assembly may be about to do? So the only way you undo that risk is to raise the rate, which means all taxpayers in the future will be paying for this activity. So I say to the Governor: Get out your eraser. If this happens and you sign it, the state of the State is not good, job creation in the future is not good, economic development for Illinois is a thing of the past.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Tom -- excuse me. Senator Thomas Dunn. SENATOR DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. Well I, too, am for a repeal of the Retail Rate Law. It's obvious that this was a good, well-intended idea that has gone bad, and I think it's worse today, with all due respect to my friend, Senator O'Malley, and his intentions, which I think he is well-intended, but I think this is an invitation for a disaster. Business relied on our stated intention. They relied on the benefits that we were going to give them, and now that they've made the investment, we're going to pull the rug out from underneath them and say, "Sorry, the millions of dollars that you've invested, based on our is no longer going to be there." And now the people who bought these bonds, the retired people who bought these bonds, good faith, are going to suffer. And, it's my understanding, that the Deferred Comp. of the State of Illinois has seven million dollars invested in these bonds. These are your fellow employees the State of Illinois who've sacrificed with their hard-earned money, who put money aside for the future so that they could enjoy a -- a decent standard of living. What about those people? say we're a litigious society today. Well, if there was ever an invitation to become a more litigious society, it's based on this bill. This bill could be crafted so that we could avoid suits, so

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

that we could avoid defaults, and that's what ought to be done. This bill should be held, and we should all get together to try to make the best deal we can make and get out of a well-intentioned, gone-bad set of circumstances.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Thank you, Madam President. As many of you know, I always oppose subsidies, whether it's for an individual or a business, and I would support the repeal of the Retail Rate Law if for no other reason than it would repeal a State subsidy for I don't believe the State should be in the business of picking out the winners and losers in the marketplace in trying to take the ones that -- the businesses it likes and taking taxpayer dollars to subsidize them. But I know a lot of you, particularly on the other side of the aisle, don't agree with my philosophy against business subsidies and you do support some subsidies. But think back. What was the original rationale for the Retail Law? The original rationale, back in 1988, was that the State was running out of landfill space and that we needed something to -we needed to do something with our garbage, and that was the origin of this subsidy for incineration. Well, here we are in 1996 and surprise! The State isn't running out of landfill space. In fact, we have a third more landfill space than we had in 1988. So the original rationale for this law is no longer there. can see as a rationale for a continued subsidy is that a lot of people are going to get very rich very quick by getting taxpayer money funneled to them. Now, a lot of you have made the argument that somehow the bondholders who bought these bonds are going to be able to sue the State because we repealed the subsidy, think that's absolutely erroneous. No one has a right to expect that a State subsidy shall be in place forever. And what happened

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

with these bond purchasers or the people who issued the bonds In an attempt to capture the value of that they got greedy. subsidy for the next twenty years, they issued bonds that, effect, capitalized the net present value of that twenty-year subsidy, and they already got the money. And the developers of the incinerators have walked away in the case of Robbins with three hundred and eighty million dollars. They're laughing all the way to the bank. Well, it's because the guys who issued those bonds and the developers got greedy; they took the money and they went out and raised it by issuing junk bonds that bore a high rate of interest. And I am told by Senator DeAngelis that the bonds bore a nine percent rate of interest, but they're tax-free bonds. The tax equivalent yield on bonds like that is somewhere in the neighborhood of fourteen percent. These were junk bonds. bore a high rate of interest because everyone who bought them had be compensated for the risk that the State would later repeal this law. And in fact, it was disclosed in the prospectus for the Robbins incinerator bonds that anyone who bought these securities was on notice that the State could repeal the subsidy and could repeal the revenue stream for these bonds. So, the junk speculators, in many of these big companies, like Dreyfus, Putnam, Travelers, Prudential, Van Kampen, Merritt - these are big boys I'm talking about - they knew what they were getting into. they bought these bonds for their junk bond portfolios, they knew they were taking the risk that the State would repeal the 1986, the federal government changed laws regarding the depreciation on real estate and a lot of real estate lost their money, but those people didn't have a cause of action against the federal government. This is absolute nonsense. there's a cause of action against anyone here, it's against the issuers of the bonds if they didn't adequately disclose the risk. bond investors that you have all talked about have a Maybe the

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

10(B)(5) action against the issuers in the case of -- I won't name the names of the underwriters but we all know who they were, or we can find out. Maybe those people didn't adequately disclose the risk and maybe they should be sued. One final thing: I've heard much that this was an economic development bill; that we were Well, in the case of the Robbins to create jobs. Incinerator, we created -- we're going to create eighty Guess what the subsidy amounts to for each of those eighty jobs: a hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars per job, per Well, why don't we just pick out eighty people in the Village of Robbins, as the Chicago Tribune article suggests, and send each a hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars and call that economic development? Maybe the reason is, you don't want to do 'cause you wouldn't get the incidental benefit of creating pollution and polluting all the surrounding neighborhoods. in any case, this is an excellent bill, and don't know. But Senator O'Malley should be congratulated, because since the day he came into the Legislature, he has persisted in the face of an army of lobbyists, because there's so much money to be made with this subsidy; he has persisted, and he's finally got to a vote, which I hope we will win. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the -- would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator O'Malley, you have indicated, during numerous times on this Floor, your opposition to the construction of the incinerator in the Village of Robbins. Will this bill, to repeal the Retail

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Rate Law, impact on that incinerator being built?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Jones. Ι have -- you're absolutely correct. made it perfectly clear to you, individually, and to this Body on numerous occasions where I stood on this issue. In fact, I'm happy to -- to say to you, Senator Jones, that you supported the repeal when it first passed the Senate, went to the House and, unfortunately, languished over there. So let me say thank you for doing that for me. But -- well, please allow me to finish my I have absolutely made it clear since the day I walked in here that this is an important issue in the 18th Legislative District, as it is in the 19th Ward of Chicago and other areas of the State. But notwithstanding that, we must deal with public policy statewide. If, as you suggest on the other side of the aisle, that a repeal is appropriate for the rest of the State but not for the 18th Legislative District or the 19th Ward of Chicago, then I submit to you that that's wrong policy, because what's good the rest of the State is good for my neighborhood and it's good for your neighborhood.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, from the constituents in my district who have contacted me regarding this particular issue, they are under the assumption that by passing this repeal law that that would -- that the incinerator would not be built and would not be operating. And that is not so. So again, once again, here we have municipalities across this State who look to the State, and the State says, "We want to give some incentives to create jobs for business development and growth." And these individuals, companies, as

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

local municipalities, went out and followed the law and issued those bonds. Now, if you were talking about being this issue, you would've said to those persons who did such, "Okay, we recognize that you did follow the law. Maybe bad idea. Perhaps what we should do is grandfather you in but not issue any more permits, as such." But to penalize someone for following the incentives that this Body, this State, gave them, don't think that is the right thing to do. When you talk about the Robbins Incinerator has about six jobs, sure, construction jobs, and there'd be approximately ninety permanent jobs at that facility. But that is a poor community; same as Ford Heights. And they look to the State of Illinois for guidance. when the Governor gave that State of the State Address yesterday, he talked about creating jobs. What about all other incentives that we give business in this State, be it Sears moving from Chicago to -- out to Schaumburg, be it the -the Governor talking about giving incentives to build a big domed stadium in Chicago? But if you cannot keep your word, then you're going to hurt businesses, be it the Robbins Incinerator or the Ford Heights Incinerator, or wherever. So if genuinely sincere, then you would look to us and say, "Let's work out a compromise on this issue. Those -- those communities, those companies who looked to the State and followed the law, we will grandfather you in, but we will cap it in the future and we will -- and we will repeal it." But don't go retroactive, "Because you followed the law, we're going to penalize you." That's the wrong thing for the State to do. We plan to introduce legislation along those lines, to protect those communities, protect those companies who have followed the law, who went out and issued bonds, who have got their permits based on the fact that we said, "We are going to do this for you." But when you pull the rug out from them after they follow the law, that's not

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

in good faith. It's bad for Illinois. It's bad for your district, Senator. It's bad for all our districts. And this bill should be resoundingly defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Madam President. I'm confused by the people who talk about what this -- the passage of this bill is going to cost the State of Illinois. I'm more concerned about what it's going to cost the State of Illinois if this doesn't pass. In the next three years, it's going to cost us five hundred million dollars in subsidies if we don't pass this bill right now. Those are subsidies which have a payback provision which, at best, is vague. The right thing to do is to vote Yes on this bill, and I would urge everybody to do the right thing. Let's stop incineration. People are -- in the -- in the State of Illinois do not want incinerators, and they're angry that they have to pay for 'em. Vote Yes. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. I just want to announce that because of a potential conflict in interest, I will be voting Present.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. To the bill, Madam President: The responsibility to change existing laws that we feel as a Body and that our constituents feel no longer protect Illinoisans is ours, Ladies and Gentlemen. At town meetings and public hearings back home, I

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

my neighboring legislators have taken a hard position on an issue the people who elected us said was very important and very emotional to them. Those people will not accept a compromise, nor they accept any exemptions. Not only will they not accept, but they will not understand those exemptions, because they do and I repeat do not, accept the fact that the State subsidizes incineration. Home communities having incinerators may welcome those incinerators or that business to their community. The problem is, is that those neighboring communities have never really had a say-so on the effect that those incinerators, proposed incinerators, are going to have in their areas. over three hundred letters here, that I received within the week and a half, from LaGrange and Hinsdale, Western Springs, Willow Springs, Indian Head Park, which are all in my district, asking to repeal the retail work -- the Retail Rate Law because they no longer see it fit and feel that it is detrimental to their health, the communities' health, and the safety of their families Ladies and Gentlemen, a lot of community. you and commitments back home at meetings that I attended, whether were in my district or your district, and you made a commitment to those people back home that you would repeal the Retail Rate Law and do whatever you can to stop incineration to come to those Summit, in my area, Hodgkins -- or, McCook, in my communities. area, have proposed incinerators. In those specific areas, consideration is given to existing pollution of the surrounding businesses which are already functioning. That, my friends, been a problem. When you go back home today, you're going to have it difficult to explain to someone how you took a position back home and changed that position here because someone brought up jobs. Jobs is not the issue. Incineration, at this point, is not The issue is: Do you and the people back home feel the issue. the State should subsidize incineration? If you feel as strongly

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

as I do, you'll be voting Aye on House Bill 1523.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I am going to vote for this bill, but I did want to point out, and I -- before I do, I want to thank Senator Raica, who is a gentleman and a scholar, a very, very decent person, for standing with me tomorrow. But I find it rather ironic, ironic that some of the people who have spoken on both sides of this issue and mention local control didn't give a darn about my community yesterday on that vote. But I'm going to vote Yes because I'm not a hypocrite. It's just unfortunate that some of us seem quite hypocritical today when they're saying no pollution for my community, but pollution for your community yesterday, Rickey Hendon, was all right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator O'Malley, to close. SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Madam President. I'm going to be as brief as I can be. I do want to cover a couple of issues that were raised during the debate on the Floor. First of all, the subject matter of the Illinois policy for solid waste disposal — anybody hear of recycling? Recycling is not even on the table here. All we hear about is the difference between incineration and landfills. The State's policy is recycling, number one. I'm just going to briefly say this. We have spent more money on — we will spend more money on a single incinerator project in this State than we have, since the State's policy was adopted, in either grants or loans for recycling initiatives. Senator Cronin mentioned that or was touching on that in his comments. I'm a hundred percent with him, and we should all get on board to do the right thing, by putting our money behind our State's policy in supporting

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

recycling efforts in the State of Illinois. There's tremendous interest in this issue across the State, and it's growing Just about every major newspaper in the State has come interest. out with a position one way or the other. It's even reached to the Wall Street Journal. I just want to share with you the comments of the Chicago Sun-Times, and I'm only going to do their editorial in part. This was published in December '95: "Illinois is on its way to becoming the garbage burning capital of the nation. ... All this <sic> (of this) is made possible unusual, if not bizarre, state law that gives a generous State subsidy to companies, from near and far, to incinerators..." And when they mean far, they mean far from outside the State of Illinois, because there aren't many Illinois citizens who would do this to their fellow citizens. It goes on and says, "Why would the State pass such a stupid law?" And then elaborates on what you all decided back in 1987, of you who were here. I'm not going to question that that wasn't a good idea then, but it's no longer a good idea. And that's what this goes on and It says, "Since then, the subsidy has become obsolete. ... basically remains is a policy that enables businesses, including large conglomerates and out-of-staters, to turn a nice profit on the backs of Illinois taxpayers. ΤF incinerators are a defensible way to dispose of solid waste, then they should be allowed to succeed or fail on their own merits without the huge, helping hand", and these are my comments, of the Illinois taxpayers from one end of this State to the other. We're all pining away for the poor investors who have decided to somehow invest in high-yield junk bonds. Every Member of this Body supported Senate Resolution 1012 when it was passed in May 1994. Here is the conclusion of Senate Resolution 1012: "...That person or entity affected by a law relating to the acquisition, continued availability or disbursement of public

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

is placed on notice that reliance upon or <sic> (the) continued or unamended presence or existence of that unwarranted." Ladies and Gentlemen, I sent this resolution to the bond underwriters before the money was sent on the -- was expended on the Robbins Incinerator - before a single bond was sold. is what the bondholders placed in the prospectus, and I think it's important it be in front of this entire Body right now, for of you who are concerned about the out-of-state owners or the bond the bond underwriters who maybe didn't do their job right. Quote, "In recent years, the Illinois Legislature has considered legislation that would have eliminated the Facility's right to receive payment at the Retail <sic> (QSWEF) Rate.... No assurance can be given that such legislation will not again be considered passage during the present legislative session,...or that similar legislation will not be considered by the Illinois legislature in the future...or that any such proposed legislation, if enacted, could not adversely affect the amount of energy revenues for the Facility. Failure of the Facility to receive revenues in accordance with the Retail <sic> (QSWEF) Rate would (could) adversely affect the ability of the Facility to produce sufficient revenues to pay operation and expenses and debt service on the...Bonds." This was all in front everybody who decided to buy a bond. It was in front of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, and it's known -- we all know in this Chamber -- there isn't one person in this Chamber who doesn't want to get the retail rate off the books, but we want to pine away for those special interests from outside the State of Illinois who have been here spending money, knocking on your doors and creating havoc for the citizens and taxpayers of this fine State. It doesn't end there, Ladies and Gentlemen. The wrongheadedness of this is unbelievable; that such a law is on the books of the State of Illinois in light of what we know today.

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Who, of you over there, is willing to go back and tell your taxpayers and your voters and your constituents that you're prepared to take their precious tax dollars to subsidize the burning of out-of-state waste? Not me. And not most people in this Chamber. It's time to do the right thing. Put this behind us. Let's get over and tell our House colleagues that it's time to do the same thing. The Governor was absolutely right yesterday; most people in Illinois don't want them in their backyards, but it's unequivocally clear that we're not going to stand for subsidizing them with our money. Thank you. I'd appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1523. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 10 Nays, 14 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1523, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Messages from the House.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the -- has adopted the following...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Whoop. Excuse me. Sorry about that. Senator Demuzio, your light's on.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I just wanted the record to reflect that we have two Members that are absent today, Senator Shaw and Senator del Valle.

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Oh! Sorry. I thought you had something to do with the last thing. Senator Trotter, can -- something wait -- future? Excuse me, Madam President <sic>, go ahead.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I'm directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 80.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 80)

Adopted by the House, January 11, 1996.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

If I could have your attention for just a second please, folks. If you would be in your seats, we have one more order of business that we need to take care of. So just please get back to your seats and we'll get to that, and we'll send you on your way very shortly. Senator Lauzen moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 80. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Madam President, I -- I think that everyone should realize we're coming back on the 23rd at noon. It doesn't say in the resolution noon, but we -- we will be back on the 23rd at noon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator -- Senator Weaver has moved the adoption of House Joint Resolution 80. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Madam President, a point of personal privilege. I'm...

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'm delighted to have, in the President's Gallery, David DeRue, who is a student at the University of Illinois. He is my constituent from Lake Villa, Illinois, and I would like you to welcome him here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Will you please rise and be recognized? Welcome by the Senate. Consent Calendar. We will now proceed to -- proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With the leave of the Body, all those read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, have there been any objections filed to any of the resolutions?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

There have been no objections filed, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

If not, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The motion carries and the resolutions are adopted. Again, if I could have all Members please be in your seats. We will go to the Order of Resolutions. Senate Resolution 137. It -- it's a death resolution, and it's sponsored by Senator Jones. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President. I've made this point before, and I'd like to make it again. I would like to ask, as a Member of the Rules Committee, that we could not meet right now and wait until after the death resolution is -- is had.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

I'm sure that's very much in order. All Members are being asked to be in their seats, so Rules will meet immediately

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

following. Will the staff please retire to the gallery, and will the doormen please secure the doors. Senator Jones has moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Resolution 137. Those in favor will vote —— say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 137, offered by Senators Jones, Philip and all Members.

(Secretary reads SR No. 137)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. We all mourn the loss of our former colleague, our officer, Secretary of the Senate, Kenneth Wright. I had the pleasure of meeting him when I served in the House, and during those times when we Members would come over to the Senate and discuss legislation, we -- we came in contact with Kenny Wright. He was always a person who was fair, open and willing to aid and assist you. When I came to the Senate in 1983, he is the person who aided and assisted me in knowing the functions of the Senate, the upper Chamber. He was a nice, decent man. He was a person whom every Member who served here loved him very much, because of his fairness. It is a great loss to Illinois. It's a great loss to this Body. We are -- deeply mourn at his passing. I see his lovely daughter sitting here in the front seat, Rhonda, who also is a State employee. But Kenny Wright was that kind of a person. He was the kind of person who would go out of his way to aid and assist the Members. He served with distinction and it's a great loss to this Body, and I know we all mourn his passing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Madam President. It was my privilege to serve with Kenny Wright throughout his term as Secretary of the Senate. And let me say, he was an asset to both his party and to our party. Every Member received the courtesies of his office and he served this Senate faithfully, and we'll all miss him. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Rhonda, I want to again express my sympathy to you and to the family on the loss of Ken. Also, when I received notice of Ken's death, I immediately called Senator Rock, who I know wanted to be informed of -- of his passing. And as I recall the -- Senator Rock had asked to express his sympathy to the family, and I think he has done so by writing to -- to Sue. Also yesterday -- or at least at that time, I had -- I was trying to reach Senator Donnewald too, who was a good friend of -- of Ken, and yesterday I had an opportunity to talk to Senator Donnewald and Senator Joyce, who are out of state, and they wanted to -- me to express to the -- to you and to the family their sympathy on the loss of -- of Ken. I've known Ken Wright for over thirty years. Senator Weaver is perhaps the only Member of the Senate today that is sitting that was, in fact, here as a sitting Member during the entire term of Ken Wright. Perhaps Senator Carroll, as well. But I came here in '74, but I remember Ken back in the Secretary of State's Office when he was in Motor Vehicles and a number of us who were with him during -- during those days. I know Al Bietsch, behind me, was -- was one that we had the opportunity to work with, with Ken during those days. Ken retired in '86. He was very much a person who loved this Senate. He loved to be around people. He loved managing the business here

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

and the hustle and bustle, and he did so for over fifteen years, but he also was a person who was looking forward to enjoying the remaining parts of his life in -- in retirement. Ken was a good friend, a loving father, a family man. We know that he had a tough sledding there during the last part of his life, and as a matter of fact, I -- I wish the day of -- of the attendance of his funeral that it would have been a better day, but it wasn't. And, Rhonda, I don't know how you managed to sing the songs of -- to your father that day, but I admire very much the fact that you took the responsibility to do that. He will be sadly missed by his family, his friends and all the Members of this Senate, and we shall always fondly remember and love him for the service that he gave to both the Senate and to the State of Illinois. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I wish to stand and speak of Kenny on behalf of my late husband, Senator Fred Smith, who served in these Chambers and was a great friend of Kenneth -- Kenneth Wright. I can remember him when I used to prance into this -- these Chambers and I used to see him at his role working, and you could always see him with a broad smile, regardless of what the situation was. He was a man of pride. He was a man of patience. He was a man -- a gentleman par excellent, and he had great patience. And so I can only say, and to his daughter, and to those who have gone on and who were privileged to serve with him while he was here in these Chambers, that he too like the man who lived in the house by the side of the road and was merely a friend to man, God bless him and God bless, you, my darling.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Jones moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 137.

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

All those in favor of this resolution, please rise. Resolution is adopted. That does conclude our business for today. We will be adjourning after Rules meets. ...Reports.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Weaver, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: Referred to Appropriations Committee - Senate Bill 1260, 1261, 1262 and 1263; Referred to the Commerce and Industry Committee - Senate Bill 1242; Referred to the Environment and Energy Committee - Senate Bill 1259; Referred to Executive Committee - Senate Bill 1245; Referred to the Judiciary Committee - Senate Bills 1251 and 1268; Referred to the Public Health and Welfare Committee - House Joint Resolution 46; Referred to the Revenue Committee - Senate Bill 1250 and Conference Committee Report No. 1 to House Bill 1787.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Introduction of Bills.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1278, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1279, offered by Senators Madigan, Burzynski and Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1280, offered by Senators Parker, Fawell, Karpiel and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1281, offered by Senators Parker, Fawell, Karpiel and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1282, offered by Senators Parker, Fawell, Karpiel and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

68th Legislative Day

January 11, 1996

Senate Bill 1283, offered by Senators Parker, Fawell, Karpiel and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1284, offered by Senators Karpiel, Fawell, Parker and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1285, offered by Senators Parker, Bowles, Karpiel and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1286, offered by Senators Parker, Fawell, Palmer and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1287, offered by Senator Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1288, offered by Senators Klemm and Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Any further business to come before the Senate? Pursuant to the adjournment resolution, the Senate will stand adjourned until noon on January 23rd. And I would repeat, noon on January 23rd. Senate stands adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

ADJOURNMENT

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

96/10/07 13:44:24

PAGE

35

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JANUARY 11, 1996

HB-1523 CONFERENCE	PAGE	4
HB-1523 CONFERENCE	PAGE	5
HB-1523 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	4
SB-1269 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1270 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1271 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1272 FIRST READING	PAGE	2 2 2 2 3 3 3 4
SB-1273 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1274 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1275 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1276 FIRST READING	PAGE	
SB-1277 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1278 FIRST READING	PAGE	34
SB-1279 FIRST READING	PAGE	34
SB-1280 FIRST READING	PAGE	
SB-1281 FIRST READING	PAGE	34
SB-1282 FIRST READING	PAGE	34
SB-1283 FIRST READING	PAGE	35
SB-1284 FIRST READING	PAGE	
SB-1285 FIRST READING	PAGE	35
SB-1286 FIRST READING	PAGE	35
SB-1287 FIRST READING	PAGE	35
SB-1288 FIRST READING	PAGE	35
SR-0137 ADOPTED	PAGE	34
SR-0137 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	31
HJR-0080 ADOPTED	PAGE	29
HJR-0080 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	29
SUBJECT MATTER		
SENATE TO ORDER-SENATOR WEAVER	PAGE	1
PRAYER - THE REVEREND LONNIE H. LEE	PAGE	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
JOURNAL - POSTPONED	PAGE	
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
INTRODUCTION - SENATOR LAUZEN	PAGE	2
GUEST SPEAKER - MISS ILLINOIS, B. PRZYBYCIEN		3
SENATE STANDS IN RECESS	PAGE	1 1 2 3 4
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	4
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	28
RESOLUTIONS CONSENT CALENDAR - ADOPTED	PAGE	30
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	34
		2,