88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 89th 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 Pastor Norman Mendell, United Methodist Church, Ashland {sic} (Athens), Illinois. Pastor Mendell.

PASTOR NORMAN MENDELL:

(Prayer given by Pastor Norman Mendell)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Will you please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journal of Friday, March 22nd, 1996.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

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 Journal just read. There being no objection, so ordered. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Monday, March 25th, in the year 1996, be postponed, unless some Senator -- I'm sorry -- postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journal.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Butler moves to approve -- to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. McLennand, 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 379, 2587, 2773, 3052, 3091 and 3613.

We have a like Message on House Bills 885, 2347, 2618, 3050, 3367, 3436, 3520, 3618, 3625 and 3629.

All passed the House, March 25th, 1996.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1056, offered by Senator Hawkinson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2571, by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Parker offers House Bill 2697.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2836, by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2860, by Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Raica offers House Bill 2916.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3128, offered by Senator Butler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3451, offered by Senator Bomke.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3578, by Senator Raica.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3669, presented by Senator Bomke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

SENATOR PARKER:

...and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator Peterson and myself are very proud to introduce very — two lovely, young ladies, and honored to have them here before the Senate. The first one that I will introduce is Miss Teresa Nudo, age seventeen, daughter of Silvio and Francesca and a high school junior at Woodlands Academy in Lake Forest. She was crowned Miss Illinois American Teen. She represented the beautiful State of Illinois at the National Pageant held in Florida during Thanksgiving week and was fourth runner-up in the talent competition, while playing her piano rendition of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony and the Great Balls of Fire. She enjoys playing the piano, dancing, playing sports, acting and singing, and I am honored to honor our youth. Teresa. TERESA NUDO:

Good morning. My name is Teresa Nudo, and it is truly my pleasure and an honor, as Miss Illinois American Teen, to be standing up here in front of you, especially thanking Senator Kathy Parker for this opportunity. I've made numerous appearances and speaking engagements throughout the Land of Lincoln. Some of them include entertaining and visiting the Illinois Pre-Teen Pageant where I got to see Maria crowned, and I volunteer my time at soup kitchens, nursing homes and with whomever I meet. During my reign I've learned that it is not the crown that you wear upon your head that makes you special, but your true inner self and what you have to offer. Thank you.

SENATOR PETERSON:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Good morning. It's a pleasure for me to introduce Maria Rito, who's twelve years old and the daughter of Mickey and Tommy Rito, and she was crowned Miss Illinois American Pre-Teen Hostess and the most promising model for 1995/96. She resides in Lake Zurich, Illinois, and Maria is — represented Illinois in the 95th National Pageant in Orlando, Florida over the Thanksgiving holidays and came in seventh overall. She is a sixth-grade cheerleader and honor roll student at St. Anne's School in Barrington, and she enjoys singing, dancing, playing the piano, tennis and acting. It's a pleasure for me to introduce all of you to Maria Rito. Maria.

MARIA RITO:

Good morning. My name is Maria Angela Rito. I am Miss Illinois American Pre-Teen Hostess. It is an honor to be able to speak in front of your Session. Since winning the pageant, I have felt more confidence in myself than ever. I always think shoot for the moon, 'cause if you miss, you'll still be among the stars, and that your best is your best in whatever you do. A great thanks goes out to Senator Bill Peterson for letting me have this great experience. I've done many things during my reign, such as Make A Wish Foundation events, meeting with many government officials and been in numerous parades. It has been my pleasure to represent Illinois as Miss Illinois American Pre-Teen Hostess. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

...intention of the Chair to go to page 2 and begin on Senate Bills 2nd Reading. And just to remind the Members that this is the deadline week, and all of you who wish to have your bills out of the Senate, must get them in order to do so. So I would suggest that as we go through the Calendar today, you make serious consideration to move your legislation with immediate dispatch. Once again, we'll remind the Membership we're going to begin on

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

page 2. Top of the page 2. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, and the first bill is Senate Bill 522. Senator Parker. Senator Parker, do you wish Senate Bill -- Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 522.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted Amendments 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1228. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1228.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1245. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1245.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1363. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1363.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1370. Senator Mahar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1380. Senator Philip. Please read the -- the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1380.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1381. Senator Sieben. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1437. Senator Woodyard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1511. Senator Syverson. This is 2nd Reading. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1511.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1515. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1522. Senator Philip. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1522.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1544. Senator Rauschenberger. Senator Rauschenberger on the Floor? Senate Bill 1544. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1556. Senator Palmer. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1556.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Public Health and Welfare adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1578. Senator Mahar? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1578.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1640. Senator Weaver. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1669. Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen on the Floor? Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1671. Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1712. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. 1749. Senator Woodyard. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Agriculture and Conservation adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Woodyard, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Committee {sic}. The underlying bill here deals with the Illinois Farm Development Authority on its loan guarantee authorization. Amendment No. 1 -- Floor Amendment No. 1 {sic}, was requested by the University of

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Illinois to try to alleviate the problem that's been created in a decrease in funds in cooperative extension used for the matches to various counties. This would actually set up a -- a Service Trust Fund administered by Department of Agriculture to make up the difference on those funding levels in cooperative extension.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Woodyard moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1749. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the —the amendment is adopted. Senate Bill — are there any further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1757. Senator Weaver? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1757.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1758. Senator Weaver. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1823. Senator Syverson? I beg your pardon. Senate Bill 1770. Senator Woodyard. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senate Bill 1770.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1823. Senator Syverson. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1823.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. With leave of the Body we'd like to go back to page 3 -- top of the page 3. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1544. Hearing no objection, leave being granted, Senator Rauschenberger, on Senate Bill 1544. Mr. Secretary, would you please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1544.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Public Health and

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Welfare adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Intention of the Chair to go to Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Bottom of page 3. Actually, we're going to commence from where we left off last Friday, which is on page 5 of today's Calendar, and it begins with Senate Bill 1365. Senator Jones. That's where we will begin. We will begin on page 5 with Senate Bill 1365. Senator Jones. Senator Jones wish to have Senate Bill 1365 called on 3rd Reading? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1378. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1386. Senator Weaver? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1389. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1390. Senator Rauschenberger? 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 Senate Bill 1390 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave being granted, on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1390. Mr. Secretary, there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The amendment that we're adding to the bill meets the objections of the Illinois Environmental Council, makes some language changes, and it's a clean-up. It's an agreed-to. There's -- there were seven proponents and no -- no opponents. I

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

seek favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. With leave of the Body, we'd like to go back to Senate Bill 1378. Senator Woodyard would like to call that bill. Hearing no objection, leave being granted, we are on the Order of 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1378. Senator Woodyard. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1378.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. 1378 started out as -- as really just kind of a shell bill, and there are two components to this bill now. One -- the first part was requested by Department of Revenue that would allow a continuing appropriation within Department of Revenue on reimbursement to some of the counties. The second part of this bill was an amendment suggested by Senator Butler, and if I could, I would like to yield to him to explain the second component of Senate Bill 1378.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Butler.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. The amendment adds language which was requested by a Des Plaines organization called the Institute of Gas Technology. It is written very narrowly. Specifically, the amendment creates a property tax exemption category for academic or research institutes that are 501(c)(3) and which operate for the benefit of the public by actually and exclusively performing scientific research and making the results that research available to the interested public on nondiscriminatory basis. The Illinois Gas Institute moved to Des Plaines from Chicago in 1993. While in Chicago, the Institute was situated on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology and paid no property taxes. However, after moving to their new location, the Cook County Assessor determined they were not exempt. The Department of Revenue, incidentally, upheld that ruling. This Institute is strictly educational, and it's difficult to imagine why it should not be categorized as such. will answer all questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the -- the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

I guess that would be Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The Senator will yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Woodyard, my understanding is that this will create a County Public Safety Retailers' Occupation Tax Fund, which allows for a trust fund held outside the State treasury, and the money

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

would go directly back to the county that passes a tax. Is that -- is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes. That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

How many counties have passed the tax that would trigger this Fund being implemented?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator Welch, I don't really know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

My understanding is, there was one county that tried to do it, and that was Winnebago County, and that was on the ballot last Tuesday and the tax was voted down. So there are no counties to generate the money to implement this proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

I have a question of Senator Butler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Butler indicates he will yield, Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Senator Butler, as I read this, this Institute appealed to the Department of Revenue and other -- to determine that it was tax exempt, and the Department turned it down. Do you know any of the

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

reasons why they turned it down?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

No. I have no idea. Incidentally, the City of Des Plaines and the local school district support this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Well, they may -- I find that interesting, but I think an interesting question here is that four-hundred-thousand-dollar tax bill is going to be assumed by the taxpayers of Des Plaines and That, I think, is an interesting reason for us to take a very hard look at this proposal. If this was entity -- the Institute was an entity that should not be paying real estate taxes, I would suggest to you that the Department of Revenue has the expertise to have determined that and to have granted them their tax exemption. They turned down their tax exemption, and now we're being asked to provide them with a legislative tax exemption. And I'm not sure that I've heard enough or that I know enough upon which to impose four hundred thousand dollars of tax burden on the residents of Des Plaines or Cook County, regarding this entity. So I, at this point, would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Woodyard or Butler, do you wish to close? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Well, I would ask -- I would ask for a favorable vote. Keep in mind that the principal area affecting this would be the town and the school district, and both of them are in favor of it. Also, keep in mind that Department of Revenue can only interpret

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

what exists in the Statute. And it seems to me that this -- in view of all the jobs it brought to Des Plaines, it's a very beneficial entity, and we should support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1378 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 8 voting Yes, 42 voting No, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1378, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. We're down now to Senate Bill 1391. Senator Mahar. 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1391. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1402. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1407. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1407.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill merely allows local township boards to appoint fire protection trustees in Cook County where the district does not lie wholly within a single municipality or township. I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Trotter. SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Trotter.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR TROTTER:

Good morning, Senator Parker. Just a couple questions. I believe I asked you the same questions in committee. One is, this bill addresses three-member boards. Many fire protection districts have five-member boards. Is there any reason why your bill doesn't address the five-member board?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Senator, they are all included in this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further questions? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Okay. I guess I couldn't find it in there. Do you know exactly where? I didn't see the language that addressed the appointment of five-member boards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

The five- and seven-member boards refer back to the three-member appointments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. Current laws allow for fire protection districts to convert to an elected board. Is there any reason why there is not language in your bill addressing elected boards?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Because they're elected.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

They're -- I thought it said they're appointed. They're presently appointed. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Senator, my bill only affects appointed fire trustees. So there wouldn't be any point in talking about the elected.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Presently these appointments are made by the Cook County Board President. Is there any reason why we can't have township officials submit a list to the President for him to make his selections rather than having a bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Senator, there are thirty townships in Cook County, and around twenty of those are already appointed by the method we're talking about now. However, ten don't lie wholly in there. So what we feel is that they should be -- have the opportunity of being appointed by the local people in the area that really know them best.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Parker, to close.

SENATOR PARKER:

I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1407 pass. Those in favor,

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 31 voting Yes, 19 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1407, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- Senator Trotter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR TROTTER:

Verification of the roll call, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

A verification has been asked, and that is in order. Will the Members please be in their seats. Senator Trotter has asked for a verification, and as I had mentioned, we would like all Senators to be in their seat. And the Secretary will read the affirmative votes. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Bomke, Bowles, Burzynski, Butler, Cronin, DeAngelis, DeLeo, Dillard, Donahue, Dudycz, Fawell, Fitzgerald, Geo-Karis, Hawkinson, Karpiel, Lauzen, Luechtefeld, Mahar, Parker, Peterson, Petka, Raica, Rauschenberger, Rea, Sieben, Syverson, Viverito, Walsh, Watson, Weaver and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter, do you question the presence of any Member? SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeLeo? Senator DeLeo, are you in the Chamber? Senator DeLeo. Mr. Secretary, please strike his name.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Rea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rea. Senator Jim Rea? You in the Chamber, Senator

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Rea? Mr. Secretary, please strike his name.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

On a verified roll call, the Ayes are 29, the Nays are 19, and no voting Present. Senate Bill 1407, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Mr. President, I would like to put it on Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Postponed Consideration. That motion is in order. Senate Bill 1408. Senator Luechtefeld. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1408.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, Senate Bill 1408 creates an Interstate Ozone Transport Oversight Act. It provides for a legislative review of any proposed memorandum of -- of understanding by the Ozone Transport Assessment Group. The Department of Natural Resources and Department of Commerce and Community Affairs are required to study the economic impact of the emission reduction strategies contained in the memorandum of understanding. I would -- you know, this -- this really simply gives us a right to look at some of their -- some of their suggestions as to the ozone transport and, in the process, do a

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

study to see what kind of an economic impact this would have on our State, and I would ask that this be a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not. the question is, shall Senate Bill 1408 pass. Those in favor, vote Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Yes, 1 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1408, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1419. Senator Maitland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1424. Senator Madigan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1440. Senator Out of the record. Senate Bill 1442. Senator Parker. Senate Bill 1448. Senator Fawell. We're on the top of page 6. Senate 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1448. Senator Fawell, would you like to have your bill called? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1459. Senator Walsh? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1459.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1459 provides that whoever enters or remains within a building, other than a residence, without lawful authority is guilty of a Class B misdemeanor, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, we discussed this bill in committee, and I think we talked about the possibility of amending the bill. In fact, I -- I believe you offered an amendment. Has that amendment been adopted on the -- the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

No. It hasn't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, maybe you could possibly address the concerns that were raised in committee. I think that what we're doing here is, I think, changing the -- the elements of this offense, not just increasing the penalties. I know I expressed a concern. an example of someone who would be attending a basketball game and leaving the gymnasium and cutting through the -- the school on their way out. They could technically be in a -- in the school when they weren't supposed to be, but there wouldn't have been any notices posted and in -- and if I understand the effect of this bill, potentially, someone could be charged with trespass, because there's no longer any need for any notices. Even though they inadvertently were in a location and didn't have lawful authority to be there, there would be no intent to trespass, and yet, they'd still be able to be charged with it. And I thought that was what the amendment was going to address. So perhaps you could respond to my concern.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Well, Senator, that would be at the discretion of the prosecutor's office, and we do have an amendment. With the deadline coming up on Friday, we wanted to move this bill, and we would be putting an amendment on the bill in the House, if that would be okay with you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Mr. Speaker, you're laughing because we -- we've had promises to amend bills in the other house, but -- the other Chamber, but I appreciate the fact there is a deadline, and as long as you're recognizing the fact that this has some potential problems. 'Cause, you know, we always have the potential problem of the State's attorneys being up for election, being involved in a tough primary a couple days before and all of a sudden they could -- you know, the wrong State's attorney could have got elected, and they could be vindictive in trying to get even with their opponent. And all that sort of stuff can happen. So it'd probably be better to limit their discretion in some areas, and this would probably be a good one. So I'd be happy to support the bill and just hope that it comes back to us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

At what point does this bill kick in to be -- be a violation of the law? It appears to me that this is a situation where

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

there's a lot of discretion involved, and if someone came into this Chamber and the Leaders determined that they shouldn't be here, it appears to me that they could be charged with a crime.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

What -- what this bill came from is a police officer. And I don't know if you're on the committee, Senator, but a police officer from LaGrange had a problem with people trespassing in persons' garages. Now, prior to this, you'd have to post something on your garage that actually said, "You may not enter this building." And if you didn't have that posting, then the prosecutors couldn't go after this individual, even though the person knew that they were in a place that they shouldn't be. So what we're trying to do is just give -- give the prosecutor's office some more tools to be able to get at these people that obviously are doing wrong and know that they're doing wrong.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Walsh, to close. I beg your pardon. Senator Clayborne. Pardon me. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

The question I have is -- that concerns me, involves someone being in a public place and someone having authority over that public place and making an arbitrary and capricious decision that this person is in -- in violation of this law, and it's subject to too much latitude and subject to a lot of abuse. And it may violate due process. I -- the way this is drafted I -- I have major problems with this, Tom.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

SENATOR WALSH:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Thank you, Mr. President. I just -- Senator, I think that your -- your concerns will be addressed in the amendment in the House, and I'd just ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1459 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 voting Yes, 8 voting No, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1459, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1465. Senator Dillard? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1465.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the This bill comes to me, or us, from the Court of Claims, which administers the Crime Victims' Assistance Act in Illinois. This is a bill to help expedite claims for the victims of violent crimes. Under the new crime bill in Washington and some changes from the Justice Department, a grant which comes to the State of Illinois has been changed, and we needed to establish a grant fund to hold these monies from the federal government so that we process the claims of crime victims in the State of Illinois a little faster. So what this bill does is establish a crime victims assistance fund or a -- a fund in the Comptroller's Office to help administer crime victims' claims at our Illinois Court of Claims, and, obviously, it's subject to the appropriations process. And I would be happy to answer any questions.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1465 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Apposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1465, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1473. Senator Woodyard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1486. Senator Raica? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1486.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Raica. Out of the record. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record on Senate Bill 1490. Senate Bill 1494. Senator Fitzgerald? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1501. Senator Garcia? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1501.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is another further effort to try to ensure that deadbeat parents pay their child support, and essentially it requires individuals applying for a marriage license to submit a notarized statement that he or she does not owe delinquent court-ordered child support before a marriage license will be issued. As amended, the bill basically exempts

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

those individuals who are on a payment plan, even though they may be behind in their payments, if the payment plan is -- has been established by a court or the clerk of the circuit court. This bill came out of committee on a bipartisan roll call, and I'd entertain any questions that may arise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Garcia, could someone be delinquent, like say -- or, for about five years of child support, like say five, ten thousand dollars, and still be able to get this license under this bill? And if that's the case, then why would we do something like this? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

If the individual has signed up and entered into a -- an agreement to pay the delinquent child support and the court has agreed to that and is making an effort, then the individual can be granted a -- a marriage license.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

So the individual - let's just say he was delinquent five years - would have to go to court first, before he would get the marriage license, to try and settle what he was delinquent, as far as the child support, before he did receive this new marriage license application. Right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

The individual could do that - go to court and establish a payment plan - or the individual could also go to the Department of Public Aid and enter into an agreement whereby he would be making his current payment and also enter into an agreement whereby he would no longer -- he would essentially come clean and pay all the delinquency.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, and -- and forgive me if this question has been answered - I'm trying to get some understanding of this. Are you -- does this bill prohibit one from getting married if they are delinquent in child support, if the person doesn't have a job?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

To be quite frank, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Then supposing that a man or a woman -- let's say that I had children, I had no job, I was delinquent in my child support and I had an opportunity to get married to someone who would probably take care of me, and maybe help my children. Would you deny me an opportunity to get married? Let's say the man was rich, wealthy. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Well, I think that if you were contemplating such a marriage, your potential spouse might be able to help you arrange for a decent payment plan so that once you are wedded, you can take care of any due child support that was there, but the answer -- the honest answer would be that you could not get a marriage license. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, I -- you know, you may have lost your job, or something happened to you, the reason that you're not paying child support and you still are delinguent, and I understand you have an obligation to pay it. But if you got an opportunity to enter into a marriage - and maybe the -- the -- the person that you're going to marry is not in a position to sign off on some kind of obligations to pay your debts, but they may allow you an opportunity to get a continuous education or job training so that you can, in fact, go out and get a better job and help to take care of your children - this gives you the support you need to do I just don't think we ought to do this. I think it's a --I understand we don't need deadbeat dads and deadbeat moms running around out there not taking care of their children. responsibility and they should, but let's be practical. The basic reality is, if you've lost your job and you don't have any means to pay and now you've got an opportunity to marry someone who have a job but not necessarily enough money to support you and your children right now, they will be supporting you. you may be able to go on, go to school, or get into job training, get a better job or another job and to help support the family. I think this is -- is -- it's a good idea, but poorly, poorly conceived.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

I don't believe that was a question. Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Senator Garcia, what is the penalty for failure of someone to submit the notarized statement, and to what extent must the county clerk go in order to determine that there are no -- that there are delinquent child support payments? Are you imposing a sort of policing action upon a ministerial officer?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

First of all, for a person who misrepresents on the notarized statement, it is a Class A misdemeanor if they do that. Secondly, the role of the county clerk is to provide the blank forms that these individuals will have the responsibility of signing and getting them notarized. The -- that's the extent of the responsibility for county clerks. The clerks may forward this information to the Department of Public Aid for enforcement, for verification of their records. The onus is on the Department of Public Aid or the clerk of the court, which also plays a role in child support enforcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Further question of the sponsor. Senator Garcia, is it then your intention that this notarized statement become a part of the marriage application?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

So that every applicant for a marriage license must sign a statement that they do not owe any back child support payments no matter what their situation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I just want to rise in strong support of this bill. There's 1.3 billion dollars in this State that is not paid in child support right now. There are children and mothers that — that are on — and even children and fathers, who are on the welfare roll because child support is not paid by either party, and it makes no sense that that occurs. If this sounds tough and a person can't get married to go onto another obligation because they haven't fulfilled their first, then it is tough, and it should be that way. And I strongly support this bill, and urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I, too, urge an Aye vote on this bill.

I have had a couple of occasions where a -- a new bride has come into the office and had absolutely no idea that her new husband

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

owed back child support, and entered into the marriage without her eyes wide open. At least this would give the new bride an idea of what in the world she may be getting into. I think Senator Parker is a hundred percent right. Why in the world should these men or women go into a second marriage owing, perhaps, a very large debt and then possibly be obligated for another debt by marrying and having more children? It's about time some of these people started taking care of the first family before they started the second. I urge a -- an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I concur with Senator Fawell and Senator Parker, and let me add one more thing. What this bill is trying to do is encourage a little bit of responsibility on the person who is going to get married again. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Geo-Karis, I -- let's -- we've got a lot of disruption out here on the Floor, and we've got a lady trying to get your attention, and I wish you would give it to her. Senator Geo-Karis, would you proceed.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think what this bill does is encourage an element of responsibility. For heaven sakes, there's nothing wrong with the bill. They owe about a billion dollars or more in child support now. Are we going to sit back and just mollycoddle these people who want to go and take on more responsibility and not give a darn about the first responsibility? I urge everyone to vote in favor of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Collins, for a second time. Senator Collins.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. I -- I don't think many of you understand what this bill is doing. And I know it sounds good, because we all want to get at bad deadbeat moms and dads on child support. happens if -- let's say a mother who owed child support, because women pay child support and should, paying child support and she lost her job. In the meantime, she's delinquent in her child support, but she gets pregnant by another man. Whether she should or not, she's pregnant by another man, and this -- this particular man can take care of the child that she is pregnant with by his -his child, but cannot afford to take care of another child or her children at the time. Do you deny this child the opportunity to have a whole family, or does this mother now go public aid in order for the taxpayers to take care of her because she can't get married to the man that's impregnated her second child? I think this -- this thing has a lot of flaws to It should be taken out of the record. It should go into a study committee, and let's look at it and try and make sure what we're doing is not creating more problems than we're resolving. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Garcia, to close. SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would urge a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 1501 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Yes, no voting No, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1501, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1504. Senator Petka? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1513. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1516. Senator Geo-Karis.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Out of the record. Senate Bill 1527. Senator Barkhausen? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1543. Senator Maitland. Out of the record. As is Senate Bill 1550 with Senator O'Malley. Senate Bill 1604. Senator Walsh? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1604.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1604 provides that when medical or hospital services are required by an arrestee, the arresting authority shall be entitled to obtain reimbursement from the county for these expenses. It also provides that a ten-dollar fee shall be taxed as costs for each conviction or order of supervision, other than a petty offense or business offense. And I'd ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Senator, is this -- is this fee an additional fee to cover this -- is this a -- is this an increase in the fee, or is this going to be withdrawn from existing fees?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR WALSH:

This is a new fee, but it would be -- it would be charged to the person that was arrested, and it would be deducted from their fine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

As a clarification then, so this is an additional fee. This is not going to -- because from -- my understanding is that these fines are allocated to different purposes, and if this goes into place, it takes away from something else. Is this, then -- if you could clarify for me, is this an additional fee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

It is a new fee. It is a new fee. There isn't a fee right now, and this -- yeah, this sets up the -- the fund that -- that communities would be able to draw from to pay medical expenses of arrestees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1604 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 47 voting Yes, 4 voting No, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1604, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1633. Senator Woodyard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1643. Senator Dillard? Senator Dillard on the Floor? Senate Bill 1643? Senate Bill Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1648. Senator DeAngelis? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senate Bill 1648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1648 removes the requirement that statements of conditions be published in newspapers for State banks. In September of 1994, the federal government eliminated this requirement for all national banks. As amended, we still left in the requirement that at least, with State banks, they publish it annually, rather than quarterly. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any questions? Any questions? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1648 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ...the record. On that question, there are 41 voting Yes, 8 voting No, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1648, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1661. Senator Clayborne? Senator Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1661.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill does is just extends the Interagency Authority on Residential Facilities for

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Children from 12/31/96 to 12/31/97. The Authority has the responsibility for developing a long-term plan for providing adequate residential facilities for the care of children who have not -- who cannot be served in their own homes, and I ask for a -- a favorable vote. However, Senator Palmer, I would yield to her for the second portion of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment attached to this bill provides that all child care center licensees and employees who are required to report child abuse or neglect under that appropriate Act must attend training on recognizing child abuse and neglect as prescribed by DCFS rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1661 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all vote No. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Ωn question, there is 52 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Senate Bill 1661, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. I'd like to have leave of the Body to go back to Senate Bill 1664. granted. Senate Bill 1681. Senator Bomke? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Thank you, Mr. President. This will allow the Emergency Telephone System Board to use proceeds from the 9-1-1 proceed surcharge to purchase mobile data transmitters with automatic vehicle locators. These locators — the technology will enable dispatchers to determine precisely which vehicle is closest to an emergency. In addition, the system will also allow dispatchers to direct emergency vehicles to their destination more efficiently.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Ιf the question is, shall Senate Bill 1681 pass. Those in favor, vote Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who Ave. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the On that question, there are 50 voting Yes, -- beg your there are 52 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. pardon. Senate Bill 1681, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1684. Senator Fitzgerald. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1686. I'd like to have leave of the Body to go back to that. Leave is granted. Senate Bill 1687. Senator Rauschenberger? Senate Bill 1687. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1688. Senator DeAngelis. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1688.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1688 is an -- an attempt to decrease the regulatory burden on banks. It removes the requirement that a notice of special shareholders' meetings regarding mergers and charter amendments need not be published:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

however, it does not remove the requirement that any stockholder of the bank has to be notified of any impending action of that sort. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any questions or discussion? Any discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Excuse me. Would the sponsor yield? Actually...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. It's the day after his birthday. He doesn't get those rights today. Okay. Our analysis says that it does remove the -- the rights of the stockholders to be notified, and you're saying it's not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis, do you want to respond?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

No. It was never the intent of that, and I am almost certain that it does not do that. However, in the event that through some glitch that may have happened, I will assure you that that notice will be reimposed in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. Certainly. But it is in the bill that stockholders do not have to be notified. Senator, it is in the bill that they do not have to be notified.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Does your bill eliminate the notice to the stockholders?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

The answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Can you tell me where in the bill that -- now, I've been informed that it does. I mean, is it your understanding it does not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

My -- yes. They have to be notified.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

We have had a number of mergers in our -- in my community, some of which I, frankly, don't think did much good for the banking community. Does this bill say that the publication of an intended merger does not have to be published now, so that the public is informed that a merger is about ready to take place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Fawell, I may not have got the last part of your question, but if you're suggesting or asking whether the shareholders have to be notified, absolutely they have to be notified. In fact, I don't know of any merger that could ever take place without their approval anyhow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

That was not my question. My question is, when a bank is intending to merge with another bank, right now my understanding is there must be a notice placed in the newspapers that this merger is about to take place, or may take place, and there was a — there will be a — a time and place for public comment on such a merger, according to our analysis. In this bill, is that notice no longer required to be published in the paper that such a merger will take place or may take place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Well, to the bill: You know, there are a number of mergers now that are going on. I'm -- I belong now or have a checking account now in a bank that has merged and then remerged and then remerged and remerged again, and is in the process of remerging again. It would be sort of nice if somewhere along the line somebody bothered telling the public that all these things are -- are going to happen. It seems to me that I don't think it's asking too much when these banks start merging like this, that

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

they at least inform the public through a newspaper.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator DeAngelis, to close.

SENATOR DeanGELIS:

Well, I just ask for your favorable support, but to address Senator Fawell's question, the fact is that is happening under current law and it does require publication. So removing that requirement doesn't alter what's going to be going on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1688 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 voting Yes, 4 voting No, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1688, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1691. Senator Petka? Senator Petka. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1691.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

President and Members of the Senate. Senate Mr. Bill 1691 would require petitioners filing under the {sic} to specifically identify that Post-Conviction Act pleading that they're filing is actually under the Act. This legislation is in response to a -- an appellate court justice request to redress a case that basically required appellate court justices to scan a document to determine whether or not any type

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

of relief could be granted under the document. What it basically does is place a small, but certainly not onerous, burden on a person filing for post-conviction relief to at least identify that he's filing under this Act. With that, Mr. President, I'd entertain any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, I -- I believe I asked these questions of you in committee and just wanted to do it again on the Floor with regard to, perhaps, legislative intent. If a person -- as I understand, these post-conviction petitions are -- are filed by inmates after having lost their appeals, and they're done without benefit of counsel. And if -- if they were to file a post-conviction petition now, as I understand the Supreme Court ruling, there -- if there's any way if -- that the petition could be read to state a -- a ground for relief, that it has to be considered, and you want to change that. So the question I have is that what if the post-conviction petition is simply mislabeled, if there's a -- like a technical error in the way in which this is filed by this person who is not being counseled? Can they refile the petition later on? That's my...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Senator, first of all, I want to thank you for asking that question to clarify the -- this legislation. As long as the

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

petition is a technical defect that does not and otherwise — that would not ordinarily otherwise substantially affect the rights of this individual being heard, then they could refile, if it is a true technical defect. If it is very apparent from the face of the document that the person is seeking habeas corpus relief or seeking relief under Section 2-14.01 of the Code of Civil Procedure, but is — makes no reference to this, then they may not file under this particular Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1691 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Yes, no voting No, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1691, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1696. Senator Rauschenberger? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1719. Senator Mahar? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. In 1995, the Congress of the United States came to their senses and repealed what is known as the Employee Commute Options Act, and in that legislation, it requires Illinois, if, in fact, we wish to repeal ours, to so state. That's the first -- and that's the first thing that this bill does. The second thing it -- it allows us the right to adopt an employee commute option program in Illinois that

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

is a voluntary program administered by the Department of Transportation. This comes to us from the Illinois State Chamber, is in support — and is supported by the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Chemical Industry Council. I know of no opposition, and I would ask for your vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Smith. Senator Smith. SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this is not germane to what's happening right now. I merely wanted to stand, because I was in the telephone booth; that when Senate Bill 1648 was brought before the -- the Senate, I was in the telephone booth. But I wanted the record to show that I would have voted Yes on that bill. Thank you very kindly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

You're welcome, and the record will so indicate. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH.

Senator Mahar, there is a story in today's <u>Chicago Tribune</u> about these credits being traded on the -- I believe it's either Chicago Board of Trade or the Mercantile Exchange, and it says that the credits went from -- from about four hundred dollars per credit down to about sixty-eight to seventy dollars is the -- is the price of a credit that's trading currently. If this program is working so well, why are we changing it today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

This is not that program. In fact, there is another bill that we're -- we're going to deal with that'll create a secondary market for those. This is strictly a voluntary program for employee commute options.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I thought I read in my computer that there were -- you were -- you were getting involved in credits - emission credits. The companies can exceed their allotment if they purchase -- purchase an emission unit from the EPA or companies which emit below their emission standards. Is this -- isn't this the same program, or is this just a similar program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

What you were addressing before is dealing with trading credits. This does not deal with the trading of credits. This allows them to get credits if they have an employee commute option program in place. What -- and -- and, in fact, the -- the amount of credit that they would get against their -- the requirements in this State for -- for air -- federal -- to meet federal standards for air quality is going to be very minimal, but we feel it's one option and -- that goes towards addressing the long-term problem. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.
SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I -- I guess I'm not making my point clear. What I'm saying is that you currently have credits out there to pollute the air. You are creating additional credits to pollute the air. One is going to affect the price of the other, because if you have other credits you can purchase for pollution, the other ones are

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

either going to be worth more or less, because you now have additional ability in the company to pollute the air. That's what I'm asking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

First of all, in this program you're not going to purchase; you're going to earn the credits, and you can only earn the credit if there, in fact, is -- it can be proven to the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Illinois EPA that you have reduced pollution in the air.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Mahar, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1719 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1719, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1746. Senator Parker? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1746 amends the Unified Code of Corrections to permit a sentencing court to terminate the sentence of an alien offender early if the federal government is prepared to deport the

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

offender and a judge does not feel that deportation would deprecate the seriousness of the offense. Amendment excludes all prisoners sentenced under eighty-five or a hundred percent truth-in-sentencing provisions. I would answer any questions, and ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah. Just one. Would the sponsor yield, Mr. President, for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Now, if someone commits a crime in this country - and correct me if I'm wrong - and they are sentenced to time, we could deport those, rather than to have them serve their time, or would they serve their time first and then be deported?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

What we are talking about here is for illegal aliens, and for those aliens who would be deported anyway, that the option would be there for them not to complete the sentence if a judge said so that -- and they could be deported at that time. The purpose being is to save the money and to free up the beds for those other criminals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

...perhaps unwittingly and unknowingly creating a problem, as we did with juveniles early on, that you let the juveniles go out and do the selling of the drugs, et cetera, and then whenever they

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

got arrested, they just went to juvenile court and got their hands slapped until we got a little tougher with them. So what's to keep us now from using an illegal alien to sell all the drugs in the country, and then if they get caught, then they just send them back home and there's no penalty? That seems to me to be a little bit loose, and I'm not sure if that's truly what you're looking to do? And I just think the bill may need a little more work, and if you're going to allow them to try to clean this up a little bit in the House, I don't see any problem with it. What you're trying to do I understand, but I -- I think we're creating a little bit of a monster here that we may not be aware of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the sponsor, a question. Generally, I think...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Generally, I think that this is a very good idea. What assurance do we have in this bill that once an illegal immigrant is deported, that they'll be incarcerated there or that they'll serve out the rest of their penalty in their home country? What assurances are there that we're just not going to be releasing criminals who have committed crimes here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Some countries have those facilities and those arrangements where they will actually put them into prison. Others do not. Part of the punishment for the crimes is deportation, and what we are -- I wanted to emphasize we are excluding categories (i), (ii)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

and (iii). We are excluding any violent criminals. It is only for the nonviolent, like for a theft or something like that, and it is not to say that those are not crimes we should be concerned about, but the judge has the option of looking at that and deciding whether that person would be deportable early. They are going to be deported anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a clarification. The concern is that we're going to release this criminal to a home country and then they're just going to come back to commit a crime again. Can you give some assurance under this bill that that wouldn't be the case?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Unfortunately, there's no way of assuring anything. We cannot assure who comes into our borders now. So it is difficult to make that assurance. However, we do have the safety precaution in there that the judge can alleviate the -- we are just talking about people who are going to be deported anyway. They are going to leave, and they are going to leave after that sentence or whether they're out six months before that sentence is complete. So that option of them coming back across over the border is there regardless of whether we let them out six months before or if they complete that sentence. The purpose of this is to have the option where you can have the beds for those people who are more violent. We need the space, and to not have, actually, the taxpayers paying for the cost to incarcerate a criminal who would be deported anyway.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle. But before -- Senator del Valle, I don't know if you could even hear what was being discussed between the previous speaker and the -- and the one asking the question because of the roar that seemed eminent from over in your area there. So, if we would hold it down so that everybody would be able to hear the speaker and hear the question, I think we would all be better for it. Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Parker, I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

She will yield, Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Parker, I -- I understand the intent here. I understand what you're trying to -- to do. I think that your goal here is to save the taxpayers of Illinois some money. I think that's your goal, but I'm not sure that we are accomplishing that goal, or reaching that goal, by approving this legislation. I would really urge you to consider taking this bill out of the record and maybe taking a real careful look at it over a period of a few months, because I don't think that your intention is to allow individuals who have committed crimes in the State of Illinois, and who have been found guilty for committing those crimes, I don't think your intention is to allow those individuals...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker. Let's let Senator Parker respond to that

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

request.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

...to, in effect -- if I could...

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you. I -- I appreciate the questions and concerns that people have, and I will take it out of the record. The Judiciary Committee is meeting tomorrow, and maybe we can alleviate a few of the concerns. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Thank you. We are at the bottom of page 7. Senate Bill 1759. Senator Philip? Senator Philip, on Senate Bill 1759. Senate Bill 1759, Senator. Out of the record. We now proceed to page 8, the top of page 8, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1762. Senator Syverson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1762.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1762 is the safe driver renewal initiative brought to us from George Ryan in the Secretary of State's Office. This is just another example of the efforts of Secretary Ryan to improve and to make more efficient, convenient drivers' facilities in Illinois. This proposal does two things. First, under the safe driver renewal initiative, each year approximately 1.1 million motorists with clean driving records will be able to renew their driver's license over the telephone or through mail, saving taxpayers about — approximately four hundred thousand dollars and making it much easier to renew their license. The second part: The legislation also extends the expiration date

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

for senior and disabled identification cards from five years to ten years, also allowing them to renew by mail or by phone. I'll be happy to answer any other questions. I know of no objection to this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1811 -- I beg your pardon - Senate Bill 1762 All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, there are 52 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting 1762, having received the required Senate Bill constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1764. Senator Fawell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1765. Philip? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1765...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PHILIP:

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

I'd ask leave to -- re-refer to Rules Committee Senate Bill 1765.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Leave is requested. Leave is granted. Moving down the Calendar, Senate Bill 1766. Senator Philip. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1766.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1766 amends the State Finance Act by permitting the Secretary of State's Motor Vehicle Facilities in Bloomington, Lombard, Schaumburg to maintain a two-thousand-dollar petty cash fund. They now are at one thousand dollars. This doubles it. Evidently, a thousand dollars is not enough. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1766 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1766, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1769. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1769.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1769 amends the State Finance Act. Authorizes the Secretary of State to create a special license plate for Masons. A portion of this license fee will go towards the Illinois Masonic Foundation for Prevention of Drug Abuse Among It increases the fee twenty-five percent {sic}. Fifteen dollars go to the Secretary of State for expenses, and ten dollars goes to that fund. Be happy to answer any questions.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I had a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Philip, isn't this the first license plate we've had for a private group that is an ongoing plate, as to a temporary plate similar to the Michael Jordan plate we had last year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

This happens to be for charitable purposes. They -- they have a fund which is called Masonic Foundation for the Prevention of Drug Abuse Among Children.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I'm just curious as to why we have the Masons and not the Knights of Columbus. My understanding is that if you're a Knight of -- if you're a member of the Knights of Columbus, you cannot be a member of the Masons. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

That is incorrect. There are quite a few of them that are Masons and are both. And I don't have any objection to the Knights of Columbus having their own plate. Nobody asked me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion?

SENATOR PHILIP:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

You'll never get the sale unless you ask. I have no objection to the Knights of Columbus whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Demuzio just asked me to ask you, then, to take it out of the record, because he has a Knights of Columbus amendment he wishes to add to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, would the Senator like to close?

SENATOR PHILIP:

If you're serious about it, you know, the last day for bills is this Thursday. Now, if you're serious about it, I don't have any problem with that at all, Vince. If we're playing games, I'll take a roll call. ...I'll take a roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1769 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1769, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Bill 1773. Senator Fitzgerald. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1777. Senator Donahue? Out of the record. Senate Bill Senator Molaro. Senator Molaro? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1796. Senator Molaro. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1805. Senator Burzynski? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1805.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill creates the offense of gang intimidation, and this bill has been through extensive debate in the Judiciary Committees. It passed out on the Agreed Bill List. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions that folks might have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not. question is, shall Senate Bill 1805 pass. Those in favor, vote Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1805, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Bomke, on Senate Bill 1811, do you wish this bill returned to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Bomke does seek leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1811 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1811. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senators Bomke and Luechtefeld. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. The -- the amendment just clarifies further the -- defining the boundaries between a municipally operated electric company and a investor-owned electric company. The additional -- or, the amendment better defines it by stating that an investor-owned utility providing natural gas to

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

municipalities within the municipal limits may continue to do so after this Act has passed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1812. Senator Bomke. It is on 3rd Reading. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1814. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1853. Senator Karpiel? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1881 is Senator O'Malley's. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1883. Senator Rauschenberger. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1883.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senate Bill 1883, in its original form, changed the fall election that we currently hold for school boards and for community colleges and moved it into the spring municipal election. Clerks across the State of Illinois have reported consistently that turnout in the fall nonpartisan school election runs between nine and ten percent of the electorate. Turnout in the spring municipal nonpartisan election runs between twenty and twenty-five percent. It's a pretty clear-cut bill. The Clerk's Association is in support of it, but concerned about how it phases

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

in. We've promised to work with them in the House if they can come up with a plan that makes phase-in more appropriate. David Orr, the Clerk of Cook County, is a very strong supporter of the bill and estimates that it will save his office between a million and a million and a half dollars a year. They hope, in -- in a four-year cycle, to save enough money to purchase new election Statewide savings by the State Board of Elections are estimated to be about two million dollars. For everybody's awareness, the IEA has expressed some concerns; so has the School Board Association and so has the Library Association - all based the fact that they lose one opportunity for a referendum. -- currently under our law, eight months is the longest period of time any local government would have to wait to go to referendum. Passage of this law would make the longest period of time months. I think that the statewide savings, the increase in electoral participation are worth the three-month difference. This bill also has two amendments that I'll ask the amendment sponsors to briefly explain. And I would ask -- or, yield to Senator Palmer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment requires that the Chicago Board of Elections publish the names of those persons who have been removed from the voting rolls during a major purge and to publish them in the general circulation papers - names and addresses - in the ten-day period following the last day of the canvass. The cost of this is minimal. For example, in the Chicago Tribune, it costs seven thousand dollars to publish the names. It is in the same fashion that if your house were in jeopardy from back taxes. Voting rights is certainly one of the most important of our rights. And I'd ask for favorable support.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill, for obvious reasons. It's a money-saver to taxpayers in the State of Illinois. It rids us of some unnecessary elections in the State of Illinois. But in addition to that, there is an amendment -Amendment No. 2 - to Senate Bill 1883 which essentially brings ethics and standards of conduct to the office of ward What the bill essentially does is to prohibit an committeeman. individual who might be elected to the office of ward committeeman from serving in such capacity if that individual has to do time in a State or a federal penitentiary. It arises as a result of an investigation in the City of Chicago where some aldermen and other officeholders were -- are due to go to jail; however, there is nothing in the law currently to prohibit that from being the case. This amendment would change that, and I would urge favorable passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise in support of this wonderful legislation, primarily, of course, to save the taxpayers' money, but also because of the notification that will be given out to people who have been purged, many of whom's voting rights have been taken from them by the Chicago Board of Elections. I just would hope that the sponsor would come up with some stronger legislation to reign in the most corrupt board of elections probably in America, and that is the Chicago Board of Elections, which is, by far, the most corrupt board of elections that I have ever known of, read about or heard of. So I strongly support this legislation and just hope that we will come up with

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

some more legislation similar to this. Especially those on the Republican side of the aisle, you must be concerned, because if they'll cheat us Democrats in Chicago, they most certainly will cheat the heck out of you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, I just want to thank everybody for the time, and the consideration, and the support. This is a good bill made better by two good amendments. Think we should send this over to the House. If the clerks have further suggestions on implementation, we're happy to listen to them. I'd ask for a favorable roll call. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1883 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Yes, 2 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1883, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We move to page 9, the top of page 9, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. See Senate Bill 1887. Senator Burzynski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1902. Senator Karpiel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1917. Senator Bomke. Out of the record. As you may recall, we started on page 5 with Senate Bill 1365. So we will now return to page 3 and proceed through 3rd Readings. First bill, Senate Bill 542. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1239. Senator Cronin? It's a recall, if you would so wish, Senator. There is an amendment. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1240. Senator Butler? Senator Butler, do you wish Senate Bill 1240 returned to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? No. remind everybody now, we're on page 4, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Might take a glance at the Calendar and take a look and see what's

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

coming up, so that if you've got a bill out here coming up, be prepared to call it. Senate Bill 1243. Senator O'Malley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1246. Senator Madigan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1255. Senator Bomke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1256. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1258. Senator Parker. Senator Parker, excuse me. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise, Senator?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Just on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

State your point, Senator.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, we know you're four short over there. It would be a good day to call your controversial stuff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Thank you for bringing that to the attention of the Chair. Senator Parker, do you wish to call your controversial bill? 1258. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1258 amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, the State Finance Act and the Illinois Income Tax Act to create a checkoff for the Mental Health Research Fund and a checkoff for the Children's Cancer Fund. I would ask for a favorable vote and answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, question is, shall Senate Bill 1258 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1258, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill Senator Maitland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1268. Senator Syverson? Senator Syverson, are you on the Floor? Out of Senate Bill 1278. Senator Geo-Karis. Out of the the record. record. Senate Bill 1279. Senator Madigan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1288, Senator Klemm, is out of the record. Bill 1300. Senator Parker. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1313, O'Malley, is out of the record. Senate Bill 1315. Jacobs. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1315.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. The bill basically does what it says. Started out as a combat veterans' license plates. The Secretary of State's Office come and said, "Let's make it a veteran's license plate, and then we'll give them room on the side to take care of that." We agreed to that. The Secretary of State does have one other amendment. They said they were not going to be able to get it in time to us, so we'll put that on in the House, which will allow the -- part of the fifteen-dollar fee to fund veterans' library grants. So I just -- know of no known opposition and ask for your support.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any question? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1315 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1315, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1320 is Senator Maitland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1322 is Senator Rauschenberger. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1322.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. 1322 is kind of a little bill that — that does something that I think is very important. It repeals the TIF districts in the State of Illinois. For those of you who have had some experience with TIF districts and the abuses of TIF districts, you should be aware that there's — it's a very controversial program throughout the State of Illinois. Although it was birthed in — in — for good reason and is applied most of the time, perhaps — as much as sixty or seventy percent of the time — effectively and correctly, the abuses of the eight definitions of what a blighted area is are legion. For more than two, two and a half years, Senator Aldo DeAngelis and other Senators and some Members in the House have worked valiantly to try to get the proponents of TIF districts to come to the table and narrow the definition so that we don't have

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

property that's being developed as a TIF, so that we don't have stores moving four miles apart from one TIF district to another, so we don't have a TIF legislation that creates blighted areas by having commercial property owners hold municipalities and local governments hostage to the TIF process. TIF legislation, tax funds that would normally go to school districts are reserved to develop property. Now, that's a good idea areas that need it; it's a good idea for blighted property; it's a idea for brownfield sites. It's not a good idea the way it's being applied. The reason that I seek this Chamber to move this bill are a number of things. We're continuing to try to get the TIF association, and the municipal governments, and other people agree to reforms. By sending this bill out of the Senate and into the House, we can help send a message that we are intentional about reforming the -- the definitions of TIF districts. negotiations have continued, they have not been terribly fruitful, and I think this gives us the hammer that can help us move toward reformed TIF Statute that's good for the State of Illinois. addition, we have -- the municipal governments, I think, are going to be down tomorrow, and I think everyone should know here, would rather have them conversing with Members of the House than bothering you in your offices. So this opportunity to strike a blow for economic equity, for the right thing for your school districts, for the right thing for taxpayers of the State of Illinois, that we have really got to narrow TIF abuses, and this bill will serve as a message, I think, that may bring the Tax Increment Association to the -- to the table.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Question of the sponsor.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

If you thought that the TIF district legislation should be reformed, why didn't you just amend it to -- to put in your reforms, rather than throwing the baby out with the bath -- the water, which you are doing by repealing this whole thing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Senator Geo-Karis, for asking that question. Our staffer on the Revenue Committee has been working on a conference committee for more than a year, I think, in drafting various versions of TIF amendments, and redefinitions, and -- and corrections. This bill was to send a message that the -- the Legislature was tired of abuses and wanted them to negotiate on the conference committee. I don't see any point in amending this bill if we can't get agreement on that conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I rise to speak against this bill. I think we have been trying to use the tax increment finance in some of these municipalities to the benefit of them. We have distressed area, for example, in my town, and we have approved it. And I think it's too soon to try and just repeal this bill. I really feel that if anything should have been done, it should have been restructured, but not completely amended. And what you're doing is repealing it completely, and I rise in opposition to your bill. And I might tell you that the Municipal League is against it, and there's a whole flock of -- mayors -- DuPage Mayors and -- and Managers Conference against it, the Illinois Association of

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Realtors is against it, the Illinois State Bar Association is against it, Northwest Municipal Association is against it. And frankly, I'm against it, because I don't think this is the right way to go. I think it should have been reformed and brought the reforms to us to -- to handle, and not to be afraid of meeting the people who are coming tomorrow. I speak against the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Madam President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to this bill also, and I think Senator Geo-Karis put it in good words, and that is that we're throwing out the baby with I doubt if there is one Senator in this Chamber bathwater. who has not experienced a good result from a TIF district. in my own area there are at least three that are -- that have created jobs, been economic -- economically beneficial and who have the support of the -- of the people. I think this is kind of an arrogant abuse of our power; that we can just arbitrarily decide that since we can't bring people to the bargaining table, that we're going to throw out the whole idea. TIF districts have served every -- so many towns so well that I think we ought to be just a little cautious and we ought to not -- we ought to wait to see what the municipalities might come along with as -- as an alternative. But, by allmeans, let's not be arrogant and knock out a good -- a good thing. I urge you to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in opposition, and I rise in opposition for a couple reasons. One may be pride of authorship, since I am the author of TIF districts, and now you know what the problem is. I

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

do agree there have been significant abuses. I do agree it's supposed to be limited to near-blighted areas and could have been used and should have been used not only for economic develop, but for housing stock as well. And, yes, we have not seen that. yes, we have seen things that should not have been And. deemed near-blighted areas developed as TIF. But in my own district I have had two or three, as -- as Senator Butler has just said, where there was true blight. And, in fact, it was a very effective use. The first one, for example, in the City of Chicago happened to be in my district, where they took an old car dealership that -- it was about two blocks long, long abandoned, becoming a building that was having all kinds of problems with gangs, et cetera, and turned it into a very terrific shopping center that brought jobs to our community and income to the City and to the State. Likewise, when Bell & Howell chose to move out of Lincolnwood and left about a half-mile square, vacant, no jobs, no income and deteriorating, the Lincolnwood Town Center was built and a couple -- car dealerships were built that have significantly increased the income to not only that Village, but the jobs to the entire community. TIFs are good if they are done right. If there are problems - and I agree with you, Senator Rauschenberger; there are problems - we should address those problems. But to take away good tool of development that creates jobs, hopefully, in the future, creates more housing out of blighted areas, would be absolutely wrong, and I would urge its defeat.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, stand in strong opposition to this Senate bill. If one looks at the history of the TIF districts, there were some problems early on with the sales tax TIFs. We have resolved that

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Now, if there are some problems with the property tax TIF, let's resolve that issue. Senator Geo-Karis is absolutely right, that we should not be looking to do away with this bill in its entirety -- or with this -- with the TIFs in entirety; we should be looking to modify. Anytime there's a problem, I think And when one looks at -- I think, Senator, you our resolve. indicated that there was a -- they were tired of abuses, and I'm just curious as to what type of abuses that we're talking about. I know very full well that the school districts, in many want the years accelerated. They want to get their money faster. We understand that. But, yet, at the same time, if it is a good district, if it is a TIF district that is working properly, they will work that out with the school district legislation, without the necessity of having to -- to throw the baby out with the bathwater, as the good Senator says. just think that it's not a good idea. I think it's something that even the school districts should take a very good, hard look at, because if they do away with the TIF district, true that they may get any increased valuation for a period of time, but without that TIF district, they may never, ever get that increased assessed valuation. I ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to address briefly what some of the abuses are, even though I do intend to vote No on this. But there are abuses. When you have districts that do not need to be a TIF for redevelopment and they get the TIF anyway, that is an abuse. I've seen it happen in City Council, when I was an alderman, on the north side, in a district that certainly did not need any incentive. And they took up a TIF, and then there was a spat between the two aldermen because of — businesses across

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

the street from the TIF felt that they were being discriminated against. I would just request that Senator Rauschenberger, my dear friend, take this out of the record and see if there's a way that we can address the problems, and then perhaps we could -- I would vote for it, if we were able to address the problems. Because it should be for blighted areas, as the sponsor intended it to -- to be, and there are abuses in this program. But I'd hate to see us defeat this without addressing those concerns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator Rauschenberger, I don't think here dislikes TIF districts anymore than I do, and I've seen several abuses in my own district with those. In fact, one of those is the City of DeKalb, whose mayor happens to be the president of the Illinois Municipal League now. But I'm wondering if there's been some concern or if there's been an effort to really address those abuses by giving the Department of Revenue some teeth to be able to better define what a blighted area is and really work that into the definition of the TIF district, rather than just totally abolishing them. I have concerns simply because I've got schools who are now -- some of the areas that they're in do qualify to be in TIF districts, and with this change, they're not going to be able to recoup anything that they've lost over the last ten years. That's why I ask the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Well, thank you, Senator Burzynski, for your concern. Let me say that — that enhancing the powers of the Department of Revenue for oversight of TIF districts is under negotiation, and it's one of the things that the reform people think is a good idea. As to whether you — there's no reason, I don't think, to believe that any of your school districts that are currently in TIFs will lose anything. This bill only affects future TIFs. It doesn't affect the existing TIFs in the State of Illinois. It simply ends the practice. So your school districts, as their TIFs expire, will get all of the additional increment that's entitled to them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator, I -- I just want, for the record, to indicate that there is a problem, and that there is a court case pending in Addison where a TIF designation has been used, in the opinion of Hispanic residents in that area, for the purpose of displacing and eliminating housing in that area. And so I would agree with those who want us to look at TIFs and -- and the definition of TIFs and narrow -- narrowing the definition, but I would agree also with those who say that this bill is not the way to go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeanGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the opposition to this bill. Senator Rauschenberger, I think the very thing you're trying to accomplish is going to be put backward if you don't pull this bill out of the record. We have made progress in coming up with a reform bill on TIFs. We're very, very close to getting an agreement. I think, if I read the mood of the General Assembly, a roll call on this might well put us back to

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

square one, because it would give a false indication of people's feeling of the abuse of TIFs. So would you do me a favor and pull it out of the record and leave that hanging out there as a threat? In the event that things fall apart, we can always come back and do what you're asking.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs, for a second time.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a point of inquiry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

State your point.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It appears that this preempts home rule. How many votes will it take to pass this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

It is the opinion of the Chair, Senator Jacobs, that this legislation does not preempt home rule; therefore, it would take thirty votes. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

That is always in order, sir. The question is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. All those in favor... Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'll withdraw that motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

All right. Is there any other discussion, questions regarding Senate Bill 1322? Seeing none, Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I want -- I want to thank the Chamber for a thoughtful discussion of the bill today. I -- I want to read into the

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

record, for -- for your consideration, the proponents of this the Illinois Education Illinois Farm Bureau, Association, the Illinois Library Association, Large Unit District Association, ED-RED, SCOPE, numerous school districts, White Heath Township Assessor and the School Management Alliance. like to briefly speak to some of the points raised. The -- the cry was several times, "Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater." Sometimes the water gets so bad, you've got to throw that water out. We've -- we've had the TIF legislation on books long enough. If we don't get reform, we need to do it over. Someone spoke to the issue of whether this was arrogant to change State Statute. You know, I don't think it's arrogance; I think it's responsibility when we act to deal with a Statute that doesn't work in the way we intended it to work. You only have to read the definitions in the Statute to understand that there's been wide -- widespread misuse of the TIF Statute. idea that's not working right. If we can't fix it, we need to get it off the books and start over again. When we talk about pride of authorship, Senator Carroll, I'd like to point out that -- that in the -- the -- the dark, dark ages when you authored this bill, we didn't have a lot of the tools that we have and that available across the State of Illinois to people. We didn't have enterprise zones; we didn't have brownfield sites. didn't have a lot of the tools that have now been offered for redevelopment. When -- when Senator Jacobs mentions that there were problems early on with the sales tax TIF, he's absolutely right. There have been problems early on with this Statute, and this Statute has resisted change throughout all the problems and all of the abuses. If we can't send a message to the proponents of this bill -- the proponents of this Act that we mean business, then we're not going to get this changed this year or There are three hundred and eighty, approximately, TIFs year.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

across the State of Illinois. Almost everything that should have been TIFed has been TIFed. We are now seeing in the State of Illinois the TIFing of greenfield sites; their TIFing cornfields residential development; their TIFing lake property for residential development, in -- under the guise that this is blighted land because it's vacant. This legislation only deals with future TIFs. It holds harmless those three hundred and eighty enterprises that have already taken place to take care of was asked to take this out of the record. those problems. I Ι think it's a good time to vote on this today. If we send this bill to the House, if we record votes on it Yes, we will make it clear that we intend to see reform of the TIF Statute. don't act on this bill, we're going to go through three more years It really disappoints me, dancing. in closing, that Aldo DeAngelis doesn't stand in agreement with me on this bill. I Aldo's worked very, very hard. But with all due respect, three years there's been no progress on reform of the TIF legislation. If we don't send a message -- if we don't send a message to the -the proponents of this Statute that we mean business, we're not going to get anywhere. I'd ask you to thoughtfully think about voting Yes on this bill to move TIF reform forward. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1322 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 7 Ayes, 45 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1322, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Petka, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PETKA:

Madam President, point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Please state your point.

SENATOR PETKA:

Madam President, Members of the Senate, in the President's Gallery I'd like to welcome to Springfield Dan Reedy, the Manager of the Kendall County Farm Bureau, and students of the -- of Kendall County, the high schools of Newark, Oswego and Sandwich.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Will you please stand and be recognized by the Illinois Senate? Welcome. On the top of page 5 is Senate Bill 1335. Senator Peterson? Senator Peterson, on Senate Bill 1335. Out of the record. Senator Weaver, on Senate Bill -- out of the record. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of 3rd Reading, on the middle of page 7, is Senate Bill -- 1664 and 1686. They are Senator Watson, and since he was in the Chair, we had leave to go back. So, on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1664. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. Read the bill -- oh, I'm sorry.

Senate Bill 1664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to present this legislation. This affects the Southwestern Illinois Development Authority, which is a development agency in southwestern Illinois that's been responsible for considerable economic growth and development. Each year we have come back and -- and put a provision of We give them the authority for quick-take. We have done this on an annual basis, and oftentimes, there's a period of time by which the quick-take is not in effect, due to the fact

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

that we do it annually. From the time that maybe we pass it and the Governor has to sign it, there is a -- there is a period of time that, oftentimes, quick-take is not in authority. we wanted to add it for two years. This does sunset at the end of two years. There's not been an abuse of power here. Т there's some concern about quick-take, but this has been one that's been very -- very beneficial, again, to the development of southwestern Illinois and several projects that -- that have been brought forth. The other provision is one in which would allow the Southwestern Illinois Development Authority to issue bonds. After the effective date, those bonds would be exempt This further specifies that the tax exemption State taxation. shall continue for the entire term of the bond, and with respect to the taxpayer, through the end of the taxpayer's last year that begins with the term of the bonds. And the reason for this is because of legislation that we passed during the 88th General Assembly that provides some limitation. This, again, is -- will create a better interest rate, will save the investor who lives in Illinois the -- the tax that would be required to pay on these particular bonds, and it's minimal. They suggest that it's around twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars annually, but it will have impact on the interest rates, which will be very beneficial. So this is an economic development tool for those of us who in southwestern Illinois and which, hopefully, the entire State will benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Watson, we just had a debate on TIF districts. Everybody else seems to be using TIF districts for development for plant infrastructure. Why isn't your area using that? Why do you have to have tax-exempt bonds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, we have TIF districts in southwestern Illinois, and what we're asking for, with the tax exemption, is very similar to what is already being provided to the Quad Cities Regional Development Authority. We -- we're just asking that we be given the same consideration. In fact, there's some nine different State entities that already have some form of tax -- tax exemption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator -- Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, you know, this seems to me to be getting like the old civic center races we used to have, where each of us would stand up and have a town in our district where we wanted a civic center. Now, we've got six other areas that have development districts. Only Quad Cities has tax exemption. Now you want a tax exemption. What about the rest of our districts? Why don't we make them all uniform? Why do we have a different rule for each district based upon, you know, who stands up here with a bill? Would you be willing to amend this in the House to include all the other districts and make this a statewide, uniform program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I would like to know what the fiscal impact would be of that, Senator. I would take it under consideration. But the fiscal impact will have a great deal to do with whether or not this bill

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

or any bill would be successful. As it currently is amended, this legislation has a very minimal fiscal impact, but it could have a very positive benefit on the economic development and the ability to sell bonds and develop southwestern Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Clayborne.
SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, rise in support of this bill. SWIDA has been very instrumental in helping acquire land in the area that otherwise would have gone through a long, complicated process. There are safeguards in this bill, as was passed last year, where a municipality has to authorize the quick-take of the property in that particular city. So the element of abuse has been eliminated, in comparison to previous legislation, when this bill was first brought forth. I think this is a good bill. It has been very instrumental in our -- in our area, and I rise in support of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Am I correct, in that there are quick-take provisions in this piece of legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, there is a two-year quick-take provision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Burzynski.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

That's an extension from last year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, it's an extension that they've had for almost the entire nine years that the Development Authority has been -- been available, but we always sunset it just to protect the concerns that many people have about quick-take and what they -- what might be done with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Then there's no designated purpose at this time for quick-take?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The quick-take in southwestern Illinois has been utilized primarily for the Metro Link, the development that has been taking place, which is very successful, a mass transit district that's -- goes from southwestern Illinois into -- into the St. Louis area and out to the international airport in St. Louis. So, that's where, primarily, this has been utilized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Collins. Senator Demuzio. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I, too, rise in support of this. With respect to the quick-take, the two-year extension is -- I normally have difficulty with quick-take, but in this particular instance, I do not. In addition, I think, to the proposed purpose for quick-take, I think

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

that Senator Watson just referred to, is also the right-of-way acquisition for the improvement project in St. Clair County. It's near Scott Air Force Base as well. So, I would rise in support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Senator, just checking that -- the fiscal impact of this policy of an exemption on these bonds. If -- as the analysis says that there's a hundred and eighty million dollars, and if the interest rate is roughly five percent, that's about nine million dollars. A three percent income tax, if the math -- if the math is right on this, rather than it being twenty to twenty-five thousand, isn't it between two hundred and two hundred and fifty thousand?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, the answer to that question is no. This is only on prospective bonds that are sold and only those residents who live in Illinois would be impacted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

So your legislation does not go back. I'm under the impression that the current bonds under this Development Authority are exempt from State incomes taxes. Are -- are the current bonds exempt from State income tax?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator, will this -- will passage of this legislation assist

the East St. Louis area?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Watson, to close.

SENATOR WATSON:

I just ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1664 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 Ayes, 2 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1664, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Further down that page, on page 7, is Senator Watson on Senate Bill 1686. Again, we ask leave to go back. Senator Watson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senate Bill 1686.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. And once again, I thank you and the Members for allowing me to go back to this order of business. Senate Bill 1686 amends the Public Aid Code and provides that local governments - that's townships - in counties outside of Cook County and any county adjacent to Cook County - in other words, all downstate counties - may limit the types of medical service which are funded through the general assistance program. You may recall that we eliminated -- the General Assembly eliminated the -- the interim assistance program in 1995 and also made major changes in the transitional assistance program. As a result of those reforms, some persons who were eligible for medical assistance from the State through the Department of Public Aid are no longer eligible. happening, and the concerns that many downstate townships have, and the township officials, is that the local township could be ultimately asked to hold the bag, so to speak, for those costs could be borne by those individuals. This just allows the township to have the flexibility to do what I think township government is for, and that's make decisions locally and hopefully keep their townships financially and fiscally sound. I would answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you. Senator Watson, under this bill, what constitutes an emergency?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

As I mentioned, this does create some flexibility at the local level for the townships. They would make that determination, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

So we don't know, but we're legislating and allowing them to decide that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, that's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Is this bill an attempt by townships that do not receive State funds for general assistance to deny or limit medical services to legal immigrants and the poor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, not necessarily at all, Senator. What -- what we're trying to do is create {sic} a financial and fiscal disaster that could occur in a township as a result of a medical problem, and we're just allowing those decisions to be made locally. It has

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

nothing to do with, I believe, your question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Will this Senate Bill 1686 be used for other Medicaid or welfare reform issues?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, there's always that possibility.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

In closing, I'd just like to remind the Members that this bill came out of the Public Health Committee by a 6 to 0 to 4 vote, and I would be very cautious about supporting it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Watson, the bill does indicate a -- a definition of -- of what constitutes an emergency. I -- in responding to Senator Garcia's question, you indicated that that would be determined locally. But the way I read it, the bill does indicate that it would have to be life-threatening and would result in significant and permanent - permanent - physical impairment. And so there is a -- a very narrow definition in the bill that establishes what constitutes an emergency. Is that your reading of -- of your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

You're correct. It is a very loose definition, but again, we

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

want the decision to be made locally. This -- and I want to make sure you understand this does not impact Cook County or the collar counties. This is only downstate, non-receivership townships.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

I -- Senator, I understand it doesn't impact Cook County, but we have a lot of individuals living in -- in the smaller counties that, if this bill is passed, would be denied emergency health services that would not fit under this narrow definition, I think. You -- you call it a broad definition, but I call it a narrow definition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson. Oh, okay. Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

How -- how do you define "emergency assistance"? What's covered under that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, on the -- on page 1 of the actual bill, it talks about life-threatening, or will result in significant, permanent impairment, and requires immediate attention to relieve significant present physical pain and suffering.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Collins.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

SENATOR COLLINS:

What -- what would be the qualifications -- the eligibility criteria for one to be on general assistance now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I honestly don't know what the -- that qualifications are. But the townships, in many cases, make that determination. But -- but these are only affecting non-receiver. If you're a receiving township, you do have certain specifications and qualifications. But this is only for non-receiving townships that are trying to live within their means that are downstate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

But you're talking about people who don't necessarily reside in that particular area and was there at the time of some kind -- had some kind of emergency.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, ma'am. That could be. That's part of the problem, if you want to know the truth. I mean, we've got transients coming through this State that all of a sudden decide -- that maybe something goes wrong in Bond County or in Central Township, of which I was a township supervisor. They decide something happened to 'em, and they want to go to the hospital and want the township to take care of it. I think you've made a very good point of why we need legislation such as this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator, my concern is that -- you may be right, concern is the fact that when the old general assistance program terminated, the only people that were left that were qualified to be general assistance, two category: those who will participate in the Earnfare Program and those who are physically or mentally, in some way, incapacitated and that they would be on a transitional program until such time that they would be -qualify for --I mean, eligible to receive SSI - until that was processed. So that's -- that's my concern here. I -- I don't know what you're talking about when you say that these people are not -- you know, you're trying to -- to stop them from some kind of emergency assistance. How do you -- what are you trying to Are we trying to change the -- the transitional do? program back now to general assistance? To my knowledge, it doesn't even exist. When did ... (microphone cutoff) ... assistance program come back into being?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. And thank you for asking that, because that is the very problem, is that when we did away with transitional care, we then created a situation by which many of these people expect the township to pick up the whole cost. And — and we think that that's not right. We don't think the township — local township, non-receiving township now, downstate — should be required to pick up that cost. I mean, they can establish their own program, and that's — that's important that they do so, but they don't have the whereto all and the financial backing to be able to — to do many of the things that are being asked of them now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator -- Senator Watson, obviously you -- there problem, but I'm not sure what you're doing is going to solve the problem. So I would suggest to you, like most of the bills that have passed through here today, that you take it out of the record and -- and that you look at it more closely to -- to solve the problem that you are more concerned about probably, and it's called "dumping" - you know, where people come through the areas and -- and those local governments have to assume responsibility. I think we need to do something about dumping, but at the same time, you don't want to deny people who are legitimately on transitional assistance the opportunity for emergency or medical treatments. I don't think you want to that. We worked long and hard to change that program, and I think the Governor brags about it as one of his greatest successes. don't we ought to -- to -- to do anything right now that's going to, some way, weaken that program. So your problem can be solved without doing what you're doing through this bill, and I would suggest you take it out of the record. And -- and I will be willing to work with you also, to solve your problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Watson, I had a situation recently - I know this doesn't pertain to Cook County - but I had a situation recently where one of my constituents had a heart attack, and they called 911 for an ambulance. And the ambulance, when they called, they asked, was it life-threatening. And they described that he was on

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

the floor; he turned color and looked to be in very bad shape. They asked him who was going to pay for it, and told them to call the private ambulance and — or get him to the hospital on their own. Now, what they ended up having to do is to drive this father to the hospital themselves, and he almost died. Now, my question to you is: Will this bill lead towards more of that, where they're going to be asking people how they're going to pay for it, or how — exactly how sick are they, how close to death are they? Are we really — do we really want to move in that direction, and will this take us in that direction?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, first of all, Senator Hendon, it -- it does not affect Cook County. I just want to make sure everybody understands that. It does not affect the collar counties. It only affects what we call non-receivership downstate townships. I understand your problem, and I know that that's happening more and more everyday in -- in health care providers. It's a problem that they have in trying to collect from indigent individuals, but I just don't think that has anything, really, to do with this legislation, but I understand your concern and problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Okay. Well, as I acknowledged in my opening statement, I know it does not concern Cook County, but as a State Senator, we're elected to, in my opinion, represent all the people of the State of Illinois. I am concerned with the health of the people wherever they are. And my question is: Will this bill lead to more "Can you pay?" over the telephone before you get any kind of emergency assistance? I need to know that, Senator, really.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The answer would be no, because it -- the township, ultimately, has to make that determination. That would not be made by the provider, nor would it be made by that individual who would be indigent. It would be made by the township. So the answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

...conclusion. In conclusion -- one last question. If the township elects to not have any or very little emergency service for these people, then that's going to be the rule. Is that correct? So if the township chooses to not have a ambulance service or if the township chooses to say if you haven't lost so much blood, then it's not an emergency, then that -- their rule will be final. Is that correct or incorrect?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Non-receiver townships must levy a tax. They must levy a tax for general assistance. This provides for life-threatening. Again - once again - it is not a decision that will be made at that particular point in time. That individual cannot make that decision, nor can that provider. It has to be made by the policy of the township.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Watson, don't the townships already have the authority to make decisions about the delivery of human services?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, they do have that, but this makes it more clear on the medical side. And that's -- that's important that the townships have that ability for their just creating a fiscally sound township level of government.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Watson, if the townships already have the authority to make their own decisions, why is the Senate making decisions for them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, there's been some litigation, and we're just -- feel that on the medical side of general assistance, that we needed to tighten it up. And we're -- we may be creating a situation in which we may be denying, but that is a problem that the townships have found to be of -- of great concern, as to how do we pay for this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator -- or, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. One more question of the sponsor. You have said frequently that your bill exempts Cook County and the collar counties. Isn't it a fact, however, that Senator Maitland has

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

introduced an amendment that would be statewide?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

There -- there's no amendment on this bill, Senator, and I -- I have no idea. I understand there is a bill out there that Senator Maitland has, but -- that might have statewide implications, but this -- this is not it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. To the bill: I would agree with Senator Garcia who said earlier that we should be very cautious with this bill. I would suggest that we need to vote against it. There seem to be too many efforts to put things in place before we actually have dealt with serious problems in a responsible and comprehensive fashion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Isn't it true that -- that if there is someone who is in need of -- of hospital care, per se, that most of our hospitals in this State must, by law, accept those people and -- and, in effect, those people would be taken care of?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I think they call that Hill-Burton, I believe; that there

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

is some requirement that hospitals do provide service for indigents. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So all your bill is saying, in effect, is that the township the township - who is very limited as far as funds are concerned,
because they do, obviously, have to levy for those funds - and -and I know, at least in -- in my townships, those funds quite
frequently are used to -- to set up a pantry for the poor, to help
with rent payments when somebody's rent comes up and -- and they
can't quite make it, or heating bills, that type of thing - that
those funds will not be dissipated by one person that comes in
with a huge hospital bill. Isn't that the point of your bill?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator -- Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

That was very good, Senator. I wish I'd have said it. That's exactly the point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Well, to the bill: Those of us that have township governments understand exactly what Senator Watson is talking about. Those township governments do, indeed, have limited funds. There are other ways that these people, who have a problem such as has been spoken to on the other side of the aisle, can be taken care of. It's just what we're saying is that the townships, with their limited funds, should not be -- have all those funds dissipated by one particular individual, when someone else, who is legally liable to take care of that person, under the Hill-Burton funding mechanism - and -- and, by the way, that Hill-Burton is a federal

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

bill which also gave funds to those same hospitals to allow them to add on, build, maintain some of those hospitals. This is a way that can -- those people can be taken care of. This is a good bill. It should be voted on by every person in this Assembly, and then their vote should be Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Watson, to close.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity for the debate, and I understand some of the concerns, but I -- I hope that those who are concerned about who pays ultimately will recognize that we're asking the taxpayer to pay if we don't provide some limitation. What we did at the State level, as you know, we -- we eliminated the transitional assistance program -- or the general assistance. As a result of that, we shifted some burdens back to townships, and those burdens being costs. I don't think that that's necessarily fair that we should be cost shifting to townships, who ultimately would have to -- to bear that burden. And the comment about dumping is -- is excellent, and I -former township supervisor. I was a trustee and a -- and a supervisor, and we live on Interstate 70 in Bond County. And it amazing the way people would come through our county and stop there and expect the people of Central Township in Bond County to take care of their needs. And these would be people from Oklahoma going to New York, or New Mexico going to Indiana or somewhere, and these -- that is a problem. It's a big problem. And I don't think the taxpayers at the local level, at the township level, should be held responsible for those types of individuals, even though sometimes they're -- they may be very deserving. This is a means by which it provides some protection to the townships. comes to us from the Township Officials of Illinois, and I would

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1686 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 13 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1686, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 85, Constitutional Amendment, offered by Senator Dillard.

And Senate Resolution 182, offered by Senator Lauzen. It's substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. McLennand, 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 378, 427, 431, 1285, 1290, 2670, 2691, 2799, 3057 and 3233.

All passed the House, March 26th, 1996.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Now, if I could have everybody's attention, I'll give you a little idea what is to come. We will recess until the hour of 1:30. Promptly at 1:30, we will come back to the Senate Floor and continue our business. And the committees that are scheduled for this afternoon will be delayed somewhat because of the business we will be doing. Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR FAWELL:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Thank you, Madam President. For purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

State your point.

SENATOR FAWELL:

There will be a Transportation Committee meeting at 3 in Room 400. We will have one amendment, we believe, to look at.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senate Transportation Committee meeting. Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for purposes of an announcement, having nothing to do with TIF. The -- the Senate Appropriation Committee was originally scheduled for 1 o'clock. For the notice of the Members and any interested parties that are in the galleries or listening, we'll convene immediately upon adjournment. That'll be sometime after 2 o'clock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Is there any further discussion, questions? If not... I'm going to wait so we can read in the Rules Report. Other than that, we're in -- at ease, at the moment. ... Bills 1st Reading. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 885, offered by Senators Cronin, Peterson and Butler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2747, offered by Senator Mahar.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate {sic} Bill 3091, offered by Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3349, offered by Senator Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3436, offered by Senator Klemm.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

3rd Reading of the -- pardon me, 1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Cronin, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Madam President. For purposes of an announcement. The Senate Education Committee shall meet today at 3:30 p.m. in Room A-1. Senate Education Committee, 3:30 p.m., Room A-1. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

... Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation - Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1473, Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1749 and Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1777; referred to the Committee on Education - Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1363; to the Committee on Environment and Energy - Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1266 and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1578; to the Committee on Executive - Senate Joint Resolution 85 and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1494; to the Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - Senate Amendment 5 to Senate 1246, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1255, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1256, Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1424 and Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1917; to the Committee on Judiciary - Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 522, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1268, Senate Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1643, Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1746, Senate Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1796 and Senate Amendments 4 and 5 Senate Bill 1823; to the Committee on Local Government and Elections - Senate Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1278 and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1502; to the Committee on Public Health

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

and Welfare - Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1365 and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1513, plus Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1556; to the Committee on State Government Operations - Senate Resolution 179 and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1814; to the Committee on Transportation - Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1764; and Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1279, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1300, Senate Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1338, Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1633, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1669, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1671, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1881 and Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1887.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

All right. The Senate will stand in -- recess until the hour of 1:30, and I do mean it will be prompt. At 1:30.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

...come to order. I repeat: The Senate will come to order. Senator Woodyard, for what purpose do you arise, sir?
SENATOR WOODYARD:

For the purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your purpose.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President. I thought while we were waiting on other Members to get to the Floor, I would announce that,

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

because it's not on your Calendar, there will be an Ag/Conservation Committee meeting in Room 212 at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

There will be a meeting of the Agricultural -- Agriculture/Conservation Committee tomorrow morning, which is the 27th of March, at 8 a.m. in Room 212. Please be alerted to that meeting. The Membership will please come to the Floor. We're going to take up amendments that were approved by the Rules Committee and are going to be sent to the Floor. ...Madigan, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your purpose.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

That tomorrow morning, at 9 a.m., the Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities will meet at -- in Room 400 for the purpose of considering Floor amendments. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Madigan has announced that tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., which is March 27th, 1995 -- '96, rather, Wednesday, there will be a meeting of the Insurance Committee in Room 400, for the purpose of taking up the amendments that were approved by the Rules Committee. 9 a.m., Insurance Committee meeting tomorrow morning in Room 400. When we get started, there are several Senators who have amendments they wish to put on their bills: Senator Madigan, Senator Parker, Senator Weaver, Senator Woodyard and Senator Burzynski. House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3367, offered by Senators Fawell and Shadid.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Senator Burzynski offers House Bill 3613.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3618, by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

...2nd Reading, on page 3. We'll start with Senate Bill 1669.

Senator Lauzen. Senate Bill 1669? Do you wish to proceed? Mr.

Secretary, will you read the bill? 1669.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

The Committee on Commerce and Industry adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Lauzen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1669 merely eliminates the more controversial part of the bill covering production houses and actors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, all

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further amendments? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1671. Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lauzen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment No. 1 merely clarifies, in keeping with what the Department wanted us to put into the bill and as a result of conversation that took place in the Commerce Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is there any discussion on this amendment? Hearing none, Senator Lauzen moves the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 to this bill. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it in the opinion of the Chair. The amendment is adopted. Is there any -- are there any further amendments? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. ... now going to the Order of 3rd Reading on page

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

4, for the purpose of recall. Senate Bill -- Senator Madigan. Mr. Secretary... Do you wish to -- Senator Madigan, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment? Senator Madigan seeks leave of the Body to return this bill to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1279. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1279 is technical and clarifying in nature, and I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Madigan asks for the adoption of this amendment. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed, signify by saying Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. This amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1300. Senator Parker? Senate Bill 1338. Senator Weaver? Senator Weaver seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1338 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. ...no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1338. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Madam President. This amendment guts the bill and merely makes it a shell bill. I'd move adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Weaver moves adoption of Amendment No. 6. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed, signify by saying Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Are there any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1633. Mr. Woodyard? Mr. Woodyard would -- asks leave of the Body to return this bill 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 Senate Bill 1633. Mr. Secretary, read -- are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

...you -- thank you, Madam President. This is purely a technical amendment to 1633. The underlying bill deals with dust emissions on small grain elevators. And Amendment No. 3 was needed by Senate Enrolling staff and -- so it is technical.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of this

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

amendment, please signify by voting Aye. All those opposed, by Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the -- the votes for Aye prevail, and the amendment is adopted. Is there any further amendment?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. ...Bill 1681? With leave of the Body, Senator Mahar seeks leave to handle Senate Bill 1881 for Senator O'Malley who is still confined at home from his illness. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Mahar seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1881 to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Mr. Secretary — hearing no objection, leave is granted, as I said. And on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1881. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar, will you give us -- to explain the amendment. SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President. This -- it's a technical amendment. It corrects a -- a flaw. I would move its adoption. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Hearing none, all those who are in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed, signify by saying No. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senator Burzynski. Senator Mahar, did you wish

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

the Floor?

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President. For an announcement: The Senate Environment and Energy Committee will be meeting tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. in Room 400 to consider two Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar has announced that the Environment -- Senate Environment Committee's going to meet at 8:30 a.m., tomorrow morning, March 27, 1996, in Room 400 at 8:30 a.m., to consider two amendments. Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Madam President. To announce a committee meeting of the Local Government will meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. in Room A-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Bomke announces that the Local Government Committee is meeting in Room A-1 in the Stratton Building at 10 -- 10 a.m. Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAICA:

Purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your purpose.

SENATOR RAICA:

Public Health and Welfare will meet tomorrow morning at 0900 hours, A-1 of the Stratton. Very short meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

At -- the Committee on Public Welfare {sic} is going to meet at 9:00 a.m., tomorrow morning in the Stratton Building at A-1. Senator Hawkinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. For purposes of an announcement.

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your purpose.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

The Senate Judiciary Committee will be meeting at 10 a.m., tomorrow morning in Room 400. 10 a.m., in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senate Judiciary meeting tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., in Room 400. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Madam President. I'd ask that the record would indicate Senator O'Malley is at home convalescing from open-heart surgery. Senator Klemm is in the hospital with a touch of pneumonia. And Senator Maitland is at his father-in-law's funeral in Bloomington.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

Point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Madam President, in the President's Gallery behind you, we have some special guests who are, in fact, constituents of yours from Gurnee. We have Tom and Debbie Nemeth, with their children Danny and Andy. And I would ask that the -- that our guests rise and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Will our guests rise and be recognized? We welcome you here. Thank you, Senator Dudycz. Is there any further business to come before this Senate? If not, Senator Bomke moves that the Senate stand adjourned until 11 a.m., Wednesday, March 27, 1996. We're adjourned until 11 a.m.,

88th Legislative Day

March 26, 1996

Wednesday, March 27. The -- we're adjourned until 11 a.m., Wednesday, March 27. The Senate is now adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

96/04/11 10:07:27

MARCH	26.	1996
-------	-----	------

	,	_		
HR_0885	FIRST READING	F	AGE	96
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	96
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING	F	AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	96
	FIRST READING		AGE	2
	FIRST READING		AGE	96
	FIRST READING		AGE	99
	FIRST READING	F	AGE	96
	FIRST READING	F	AGE	2
	FIRST READING	F	AGE	3
HB-3613	FIRST READING	F	AGE 1	00
HB-3618	FIRST READING	F	AGE 1	00
HB-3669	FIRST READING	F	PAGE	3
SB-0522	SECOND READING	F	PAGE	5
SB-1228	SECOND READING	F	PAGE	5
SB-1245	SECOND READING	F	PAGE	5
SB-1258	THIRD READING	F	PAGE	62
SB-1279	RECALLED	1	AGE 1	02
SB-1315	THIRD READING	F	PAGE	63
SB-1322	THIRD READING	E	PAGE	64
SB-1338	RECALLED	F	PAGE 1	02
SB-1363	SECOND READING	1	PAGE	6
SB-1378	THIRD READING	£	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING		PAGE	6
SB-1390	RECALLED	F	AGE	11
SB-1407	THIRD READING	Į.	PAGE	16
SB-1408	THIRD READING	E	PAGE	20
SB-1459	THIRD READING	F	PAGE	21
	THIRD READING		PAGE	25
	THIRD READING		PAGE	26
	OUT OF RECORD		PAGE	26
	THIRD READING		AGE	26
	SECOND READING		PAGE	6
	SECOND READING		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING		PAGE	10
	SECOND READING		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING		PAGE	7
	THIRD READING		PAGE	34
	RECALLED			103
	THIRD READING		PAGE	35
	THIRD READING		PAGE	36
	THIRD READING		PAGE	75
	SECOND READING			100
	SECOND READING			101
	THIRD READING		PAGE	37 81
	THIRD READING		PAGE	
	THIRD READING		PAGE	38
	THIRD READING		PAGE	42 44
	THIRD READING THIRD READING		PAGE	47
			PAGE PAGE	52
	OUT OF RECORD SECOND READING		AGE	8
	SECOND READING		AGE	9
			AGE	9
	SECOND READING THIRD READING		AGE	52
SB-1765			PAGE	53
	THIRD READING		PAGE	53
	THIRD READING		AGE	54
	SECOND READING		PAGE	9
25-1110	2_00HD HEADING	•		,

×	
REPORT:	TIFLDAY
PAGE: 00)2

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

96/04/11 10:07:27

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MARCH 26, 1996

	MARCH 20, 1990		
SB-1811 SB-1823 SB-1881 SB-1883 SR-0182	THIRD READING RECALLED SECOND READING RECALLED THIRD READING RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	57 10 104 58 95
	SUBJECT MATTER		
SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP PRAYER-PASTOR NORMAN MENDELL PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE JOURNAL-APPROVED JOURNAL-POSTPONED MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE INTRODUCTION OF GUEST-SENATOR PARKER GUEST SPEAKER-TERESA NUDO - MISS IL AM TEEN INTRODUCTION OF GUEST-SENATOR PETERSON GUEST SPEAKER-MARIA RITO MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORTS SENATE STANDS IN RECESS SENATE RECONVENES ADJOURNMENT		TEEN PAGE	1 1 1 2 3 3 3 4 95 97 98 98