50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

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 Reverend Roger A. Ruhman, Presbyterian Church, Paris, Illinois. Reverend Ruhman.

THE REVEREND ROGER A. RUHMAN:

(Prayer by the Reverend Roger A. Ruhman)

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 Journals of Wednesday, May 10th and Thursday, May 11th, 1995.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

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

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading -- reading and approval of Journals of Friday, May 12th and Monday, May 15th, in the year 1995, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Senator Mahar, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MAHAR:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your announcement.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Like tomorrow's Senate Calendar to reflect that the Senate Environment and Energy Committee will be meeting at 9:30 as opposed to 8:30.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Mahar. Now, the Chair will yield to Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I have with me today, and hosted by the Senate and also over in the House, the Consul General of China. Mr. Huane was appointed to this position and arrived in Chicago in January of this year. he's not been in Illinois too awfully long. The Consulate in Chicago covers approximately nine states. So he has practically all of the midwestern states under his jurisdiction, as well as a strange one, Colorado. I ask him if -- if he got Colorado in his Consulate just to go skiing out there. But, I would like him to be -- make a very few brief remarks to the Senate, primarily because six of us Legislators, along with the Director of Agriculture, had the opportunity to be hosted by Mainland China in the spring of 1993, and we found two major things. Number one, the Chinese people were very warm, friendly and compassionate to us. And number two, in meeting with Illinois corporations out in Mainland China, we find that the business for Illinois

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

corporations is expanding by leaps and bounds out there. And with that may -- would you join me in welcoming Consul General, Mr. Whong.

CONSUL GENERAL HUANE:

(Remarks by Consul General Huane)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Fawell, Chair of the Committee on Transportation, reports House Bills 199, 939, 1587, 1878, and 2294 Do Pass; and House Bill 1462 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Cronin, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports House Bills 689 Do Pass; House Bills 226, 797, 1459 and 2076 Do Pass, as Amended; and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2123 Be Approved for Consideration.

Senator Sieben, Chair of the Committee on State Government Operations, report House Bills 309 and 913 Do Pass; House Bill 823 Do Pass, as Amended; Senate Bill 458 - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 Be Adopted; and Senate Bill 992 - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 Be Adopted.

And Senator Klemm, Chair of the Committee on Local Government and Elections, reports House Bills 270, 340 and 1461 Do Pass; House Bills 505, 859, 974 and 1825 Do Pass, as Amended; Senate Resolution 59 Be Adopted. Senate Bill 75 - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 Be Adopted; and on Senate Bill 206 - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 Be Adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

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 concurred with the Senate in the

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 370, together with the following amendment, which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1.

We have a like Message on Senate Bill 789 with House Amendment 1.

Both passed the House, as amended, May 15th, 1995.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

For what purpose does Senator Bowles seek recognition? SENATOR BOWLES:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise for a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

State your point.

SENATOR BOWLES:

I have, in the President's Gallery, the eighth grade class from Our Lady Queen of Peace School in Bethalto, Illinois. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Will our guests please rise. For what purpose does Senator Palmer seek recognition?

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

State your point.

SENATOR PALMER:

In the President's Gallery, I have a constituent who is visiting today, Attorney Barack OBama, and I'd like for him to be recognized and welcomed by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Will our guest please rise. Channel 2, 5, 7 and 9 and FOX-TV

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

of Chicago all seek recognition to tape. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Also Channel 44, Chicago. Leave is granted. On Page 10 of the Calendar, House Bills 2nd Reading. Senator Fawell, are you -- move -- House Bill 3? Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities adopted Amendments 1 through 5.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? Excuse me, Senator Fawell. Senator Madigan. Did you wish to table an amendment? Senator Madigan. Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 5 <sic> (6) adds immediate -- adds a sunset date to the Athletic Trainers Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Raica, on 197. Senator Klemm, on 211. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

House Bill 211.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government and Elections adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Fitzgerald. Senator Palmer, on 249. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 249.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Clayborne, on 315. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 315.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Burzynski, on 471. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 471.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Peterson, on 507. Out of the record. Senator Fawell, on 513. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 513.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government and Elections adopted Amendments 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, on 573. Out of the record. Senator Watson, on 598. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, on 660. Out of the record. Senator Geo-Karis, on 760. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 760.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government and Elections adopted Amendments 1 and 2.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Klemm -- Klemm, on 965. Senator Klemm you wish the bill called? Oh. Excuse me. Senator Woodyard. Out of the record. Senator Sieben, on 988. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 988.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Dudycz, on 1002. Out of the record. Senator -- Senator Mahar, on 1089. Out of the record. Senator Woodyard. Senator Raica, on 1108. Out of the record. Senator Sieben, on 1258. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Walsh, on 1320. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1320.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 1398. Senator Clayborne. Senator Clayborne. 1398. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1398.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Cronin asks that 1470 be read for a 2nd time. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1470.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Petka, on 1486. Senator Petka. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1486.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Dudycz, on 1699. Senator Dudycz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1699.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Petka, on 1850. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1850.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government and Elections adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Sieben, on 1940. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1940.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. On page 5 of your Calendar, House Bills on 3rd Reading. Senator Shadid, do you wish to call House Bill 5? Out of the record. Senator Geo-Karis, on House Bill 8. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 8.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, House Bill 8 provides that the fine for exceeding the speed limits within a construction zone shall be double the bail and -- and it defines construction zone. Similar to a bill that we passed out of here, and I urge a favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 8 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 8, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Watson, on 23. Out of the record. Senator Mahar, on House Bill 41. Out of the record. Senator Karpiel, on 90. Out of the record. Senator Geo-Karis, on 119. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

House Bill 119.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator -- Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill amends the Vital Records Act and the Adoption Act. If an adopted person applies to amend the name on his or her birth certificate, the State Registrar of vital records shall amend the birth certificate if the person provides documentation or other evidence supporting the application that would be deemed sufficient if it had been submitted in support of an application in support of an application by a person who has not been adopted. And I ask for favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 119 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 119, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Klemm, on 150. Out of the record. Senator DeAngelis, on 166. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 166.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill came from the Legislative Audit Commission. All it does is, it changes the reporting requirements of certain data and it was passed out of committee on the Agreed Bill List. Urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 166 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 166, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Garcia. Out of the record. Senator Syverson, on 185. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 185.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Syverson, explain the bill.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate -- House Bill 185 is -- amends the Sanitary District Revenue Act and authorizes discontinuance of water service or sewer or both in the event of delinquents. This excludes the City of Chicago. And be happy to answer any questions, otherwise ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 185 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 185, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cronin, on 206. Out of the record. Senator O'Malley, on 207. Out of the record. Senator Madigan, on 323. Out of the record. Senator Madigan, on 413? Senator Madigan? 413. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 413.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 413, as amended, contains two provisions. First of all, it straightens up the overlying language -- original language. Clears up a question as far as pension levies in school districts, insofar as the fact that they don't pass an appropriation

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

ordinance and pass a budget. So House Bill 413 corrects that that problem. In addition, it creates an optional early retirement plan for units of local government that participate with Illinois -- the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund, with the exception of cities and villages; they are not in this plan pursuant to long-standing agreement in the General Assembly that the employer and employee groups have to agree on language insofar as any pension bills. There is currently not an agreement between cities and villages and employees of cities and villages. So having said that, I also say that all other units of local government are in agreement with the provisions with -- of House Bill 413 and their employees. Basically, first of all, it is an optional plan. intended to be a cost-savings measure for units of local government. It is not mandatory. Creates no unfunded liability up on the part of the State of Illinois. For those -- for those units of local government who opt to have early retirement offering to their employees, first of all, the -- the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund will do a cost study for them, to determine whether or not they -- this is a cost-savings measure Secondly, they must -- if they offer it, they can offer it on a one-year basis, in perpetuity, and in perpetuity being that over the course of six years, they have to pay back whatever -- or reduce their unfunded liability that may be created by this back to zero, and then they could, if they so desire, offer it again. That is -- that's basically the provisions of House Bill as amended. It would affect school districts with their 413, noncertified personnel, counties, townships, park districts. library districts, forest preserve districts. Everyone is -- that is in the bill -- affected by the bill is in support of the bill. I would be glad to answer any questions on House Bill amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thanks -- thank you, Mr. President. I guess just a question of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Well, we get a lot of mail and letters from employees of -- of municipalities, and so I would assume now, from your explanation, they are out and there is no optional program for municipalities and they aren't in any other legislation that's going to be coming before this Body. Is -- is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

That is correct. At this point, until there is an agreement between the Municipal League and the employee representatives, they will -- there will not be a -- an early retirement offering for those people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Then I am to assume then the Municipal League opposed them being included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

The Municipal League opposed this bill as it was written.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senate. I rise in support of this bill. It's been around for a couple of -- three years. Almost every other public pension fund has had their opportunity at the early retirement incentives. The only one who hasn't has been the IMRF, and I think it's unfair to all these workers that every other public pension fund has had this opportunity, IMRF has not. Senator Madigan, as well as every staffer on that committee, Municipal League, everybody has worked long and hard to come up with this compromise, which I think is a terrific compromise given the state of circumstances, and I would urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator, we had - earlier - had Senate Bill 251, and I believe that there was a -- a management rights clause in that particular piece of legislation. There isn't in this one. Can you tell me what that might mean, as far as collective bargaining?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, Senator Burzynski, first of all the decision still would rest with the - as far as offering an early retirement incentive program - the decision would still be permissive and still would rest with the employer. That would not preclude the employees from bringing that to the bargaining table. It -- it would be a subject -- could be a mandatory subject of bargaining, but that would not have to be or it would not have to be part of any final package that was negotiated between the

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

employers and employees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

State your point.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Visiting with us today, in the gallery to -- right behind me, is the seventh and eighth grade from Sacred Heart School in Pana, with their teacher, Steve Groll. I wish that they would stand -- stand and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Our guests please rise. Further discussion? Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he'd yield, Senator.

SENATOR SHADID:

Senator Madigan, in the county, for instance, the county board has to approve this, in each county. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

That is correct, Senator Shadid. They have to -- it's optional and they have to make the decision as to whether or not they offer it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield?

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he'd yield.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator Madigan, I understand this is permissive. Don't really have a lot of problems with this bill because it is permissive, but I -- but I just would like to pose a couple of questions. And first of all, we know this is good for the employees; they get to retire early - many of them to go on and take other jobs that are available, from other people who don't have retirement. But what affect will this have on the pension funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, Senator Jacobs, there would be a small initial cost. I think IMRF had estimated, last year, approximately one percent, but over the course of time and over a very short period of time, actually, that should reduce back to nothing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Just one comment. You know, I look on the federal level, see the problems we're having with Social Security; I look at all of our pension funds that we are not funding properly and are looking to be bankrupt early into the year 2000; and I just wonder if — if — we all have constituents that want this, and the popular thing to do is to stand up and say, "Hurrah". But are we heading in the wrong direction? That's a question I ask myself. We're allowing people to retire earlier and earlier and putting a burden — a greater burden — on a lesser amount of people. I think that even though this — this is permissive, and therefore it's not our

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

issue in order for them to allow this to happen, so I'll vote for it. But I think it's one that we should all stand up and take notice to, that we're probably heading in the wrong direction, and we maybe should consider looking at the other end of the spectrum.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think this is a good bill. It's a permissive bill. Depends on the county boards, the township boards, and school boards, as to whether or not they're going to go ahead with it. And I think we should go ahead and vote for it. I've had more mail on this, and I -- I think it's time we answered responsibly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield, Senator.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Senator Madigan, I know that you've worked along with many others on this bill and I think it's -- I think it's clear that it's a bill that probably most all of us will support. But just for the record, and I -- I realize it's already been addressed, is it safe to assume that municipalities could have been a part of this bill, except that the Municipal League chose not to be? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Well, Senator Severns, I suppose you could say that. They did

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

not -- they did not like the way that this language was drafted, as opposed to other units of local government who were agreeable to the language that essentially was prepared by the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

But had the Municipal League agreed to this language, you would have agreed to have had municipalities included. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Most definitely, Senator Severns. Most definitely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Hearing that, I think we should be supporting this bill and regret that the League chose to stay out of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Just a question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Madigan, a lot of the teachers who were eligible for retirement under previous systems and retired early, every time the General Assembly comes forward or any unit of government comes forward to attempt to change their retired <sic>, as far as their

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

health care provisions -- a lot of these people base their retirement or their potential early retirement on an existing basis of what they're currently paying into, as far as health care benefits. Are these people that may accept or may choose to participate in this early retirement, are they being told or do you know if they are being told of any -- any situation where there could be a possibility of contributions made by them in the future, which they may not know of now, because they do base their retirement on what they are currently making, a, and, b, what they're currently paying as far as health care benefits?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Raica, as opposed to another statewide pension plan, the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund does not -- is not involved with health insurance. That's strictly on the local level, as the units of local government -- the employee would have to look to that unit of local government. There is no statewide health insurance plan for Illinois Municipal Retirement employees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in favor of this particular bill, because I'm familiar with it and I think the Chairman worked very hard on -- on presenting it. And I've received many, many letters in my particular township, and I've been a township supervisor for twenty-four years and I think it's long overdue, and I think it's an option that we do need in the IMRF. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hasara.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR HASARA:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR HASARA:

Senator Madigan, can you tell me if the language dealing with management versus labor rights under this legislation is different than other early retirement bills that have -- we have passed in this Legislature?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

This language is not, Senator Hasara.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

So you're saying that the language is the same as other early retirement bills that we have passed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Yes, Senator Hasara, that is what I'm saying.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Under this bill, is management required to bargain early retirement with their unions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

No, Senator Hasara. This -- this is optional.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

To the bill: I definitely stand in favor of this bill. I also think it's a shame that municipalities are not in this bill. I, too, have received hundreds of letters from municipal employees who would like the advantage of taking early retirement. So I do stand in favor of the bill, and I definitely thank Senators Madigan and Burzynski and others who have worked so hard to put this together.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Madigan, on previous early retirement bills, there was a projected savings either to schools or to the -- the State. How much money is this going to save governments by enacting this early retirement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, Senator Welch, I can't answer that question at this point in time. Because, first of all, it's an optional program. We do not know what units are going to participate in it. It is a local decision by that particular unit of local government. Insofar as savings, there is an initial --studies that would indicate that about sixty, sixty-five percent of the participating units of local government potentially save money by offering this plan. The other units of local government, because of their pay structure or the age of their particular

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

employees, would not save money. Therefore, the bill is optional. For those -- for those -- excuse me, units of local government that could save money based upon the information that will be provided them by the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund as to whether or not this is a cost-saving measure for them or a cost measure for them. Then they're going to be given that information, if they request it from the Municipal Retirement Fund, and then they can make that decision as to whether or not they want to offer it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Madigan, will this be a window of opportunity for a certain period of time for counties to take advantage of this bill or will it be continuous from the point the Governor signs the bill, if he signs it, forward?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Subject to the provisions of the bill, one year every five years, it's -- it's -- can be a permanent -- it's part of the Statute and it's permanent. It's not a window.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield, Senator.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Just a simple question. Senator Madigan, do you have any way
-- have you seen any projections of how many individuals might
seek to take advantage of this opportunity?

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Garcia, in the past, we have estimated, when we've looked at things -- at these things, that the percentage of eligible participants that would take advantage of a plan of this nature would run in the neighborhood of forty percent of those eligible. That seems to have held up with the statistics.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

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

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just merely close and point out that the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund is currently at a ninety-one-percent funding level, which, as far as last year when this Body passed Senate Bill 533, we projected that it would take fifty years for the five State Systems to get up to a ninety-percent funding level. So I would just point that out that the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund is very, very soundly funded from actuarial basis, and I would ask for a favorable consideration of House Bill 413, as amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The question is, shall House Bill 413 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are 6, none voting Present. House Bill 413, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Maitland, on 447. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 447.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 447 is an omnibus bill affecting the agencies of DCCA. CMS, DMHDD, and the Department of -- of Corrections. With respect to DCCA, it -- it addresses three audit findings and changes another. With -- with respect to DCCA also, increases the maximum term for infrastructure loans from three years to ten years. also repeals the requirement that applications for said loans and grants contain certification that the community has a multiyear capital improvement program accompanied by specific information. It further increases the maximum amount which DCCA may grant to counties, municipalities or local promotional groups or loan to businesses for the development or improvement of -- of tourism attraction in Illinois from forty thousand to one hundred thousand. With respect to DMHDD, it exempts disbursements made by the agencies in counties with population of less than two million people from the requirement that said disbursements be made only to the county treasurer. And finally, with respect to the Department of Corrections, it -- it amends the Liquor Control Act by permitting alcoholic beverages to be delivered to and dispensed in State housing assigned to employees of the Department of Corrections. I know of no opposition. There was no opposition in committee. I would seek support of the Body, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 447 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Nays are 1. House Bill 447, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Mahar on -- out of the record. 567. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This -House Bill 567 allows a section of unincorporated Rich township to
be annexed into the -- the Water Reclamation District -Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. And Committee Amendment
No. 1 also allows this same action for a territory in Streamwood,
in Cook County. This is at the request of the property owners and
it has the support of the MWRD. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 567 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 567, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Woodyard, on 603. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 603.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill actually came from a constituent in our district, and what it do -- it would allow a pickup truck with a -- with a gooseneck -gooseneck fifth wheel to pull an RV and to actually also tow a boat behind that. Every state that touches the borders of the State of Illinois now allows this to happen, and what we've found is constituents of ours that may live in East Central Illinois cannot use this type of vehicle to cross Illinois to go to the Ozarks or anywhere else. And so that's what was proposed. were a couple of questions that came up in the committee, and we did get a response from the Department of Transportation. dealt with would these types of vehicles towing a trailer have any more sway or swerve than without it. And it seems that there's no evidence from IDOT of that being the case. Additionally, I think, Senator O'Daniel would -- would like to have amended this bill in another manner, but the Department was not comfortable with that. And so, as of right now, I -- I'd be happy to answer any questions, but that's what the bill does. We're just trying to get ourselves in the state -- in the same conformity as other states. And to my knowledge Department of Transportation, drafted the language, they're neutral on the bill, and I believe the State Police are neutral on the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

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

One question of the sponsor, if he would.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR SHAW:

I support your bill. But would you explain that fifth wheel again.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator, the fifth wheel is -- is similar to a tractor trailer semi. In this case it's the hitch and the kingpin mechanism on the RV. Generally, it's the kingpin that comes down and then the fifth wheel is located in the body of the pickup truck and they -- it's a sliding-latch mechanism. There are also safety chains involved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Just a couple of points, no questions, just a couple of that I think have got to be made. We let this out of committee 'cause we had concerns with being able to compete with other states, and -- and not to cause people coming from one state to another state to have problems with towing vehicles. But look at this as it is and forget what other states do, I think it's fairly dangerous issue. I don't know why any state truly allows this. What you're talking about, if -- if you'll stop and just visualize for a minute, you have a pickup truck, with the fifth wheel, will be towing a trailer who -- with the trailer perhaps is twenty-four feet in length, then towing a boat that may be twenty feet in length. You have a lot of tendency for whipping and for, I think, potential accidents. I think this would be a much better bill if we probably would have lowered the speed limit on these vehicles down to the barest of minimum, because we're talking, in many cases, about amateurs that could do this. If limited it also to professional drivers that might be a different issue. But I don't think there's very many of us, sportsmen, who would want to have a fifth wheel on a pickup truck

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

towing a house trailer and towing a boat. I would rather see us not have to pass this legislation. There is merit, because we do have to compete with other states and that's the reason we let it out of committee, and I wanted this Body to be aware of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I -- I really don't have any problem with this bill. You know, anyone that understands the fifth wheel hookup and all, is aware that they don't sway as bad as the one that's on the ball and this is very important, especially to our senior citizens that want to go fishing or something that way to -- to pull their boat behind. But, when you have the fifth wheel hookup it -- it stabilizes the thing a lot. So I don't see that it's any problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Woodyard, to close. SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, again, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Well, I certainly would not be proceeding with this legislation if I had any feel whatsoever that there were safety problems with this. And I'll guarantee you Department of Transportation and the State -- Illinois State Police would not have drafted the language in this bill, if they had a thought there would have been -- and be neutral on it today, if they had a thought that this would pose any kind of -- of safety hazard. In addition, they are -- there's a maximum length that this can be, much shorter than -- than a regular semitrailer, and certainly I -- all my intent was -- was to try to get us in compliance with what our sister states are doing. And, I think, make it a little more palatable for some of our vacationers that have to cross the State of Illinois, not to have to go through Arkansas to get to the Lake of the Ozarks in

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Missouri. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The question is, shall House Bill 603 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 45, the Nays are 10. House Bill 603, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator O'Daniel, on 614. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 614.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 614 includes aquaculture in the definition of production agriculture in the Sales Tax Acts. And according to the Department of Revenue, aquaculture's already included in the exemptions for machinery used in production agriculture. So it's -- has no impact on the State. And this bill is meant to merely -- to clarify the existing practice with the Department of Revenue. I don't know of any opposition, if there's any questions, I'll attempt to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is -- is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 614 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none. House Bill 614, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Fitzgerald, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Yes. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have visiting with me in the Senate gallery behind the Republican side a couple of guests from my district, Steve and Joan Fedota, and their children Jared and Katie Fedota, all from Palatine, Illinois. Katie is serving as my page for the day, and I'd -- I'd ask them to stand and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Will our guests please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. On the Order of Senate -- of House Bills 3rd Reading. In the middle of page 6, House Bill 632. Senator Madigan, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Madigan seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 632 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 632. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 632 adds an immediate effective date. I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 648. Senator Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, read the the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This bill was on the Agreed Bill List. It requires DCFS to create a multidisciplinary review committee in each region of the State to make sure that the mandated reporters under the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act have the ability to have a review conducted on any situation where a child abuse or neglect report made by them was unfounded, and they have concerns about the effectiveness of the investigation. The multidisciplinary review committee shall be under the jurisdiction of the child death review teams established under the Act. The child death review team, which had reference is House Bill 648 will survive the multidisciplinary review team created under the bill were established by provisions of Senate Bill 1357, Public Act 88-614. Section specifically requires DCFS multidisciplinary teams statewide to review every death of a child who have been involved with the Department. opposition to this bill, and I ask for a favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there any discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Just question of the sponsor?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Are we adding more responsibility to the Department of Children and Family Services or are we taking responsibility away? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

We're not adding more responsibility, nor are we taking it away. What we're doing is having someone to assist. We're having independent bodies -- independent group made up of -- of a -- one DCFS employee, a law enforcement official, a licensed social worker and a representative of the State's Attorney's Office to review certain documentation as it relates to a -- a abuse or neglect case, and to offer recommendations to them. The only burden that we're placing on DCFS is to -- is to adopt rules to implement this Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator Clayborne, what is a multidiscipline committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

It's -- it's just a -- a committee that is made up of various different people in various professions. Such as DCFS, law enforcement, social workers and a prosecutor from the State's Attorney's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Aren't all committees made up of different people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes, I -- I would agree with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It would seem to me, Senator, that to have many people in need of discipline on a committee, makes very little sense. Why would you want to have a number of people who have no discipline to be on a committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

You want to have various people who come from different backgrounds to give different opinions based upon their experience.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

But if those experiences are all negative and they lack discipline, why would you want to have them on a committee? It makes very little sense to me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Well, the purpose of it and -- and I will agree unless DCFS is able, and I'm sure in this case they make appointments of people who have the competence and that are qualified to render and give

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

valuable advice as it relates to issues of child abuse and neglect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, I would just say that beings that discipline is -- has been one of the key issues of this Legislative Body, that because we want discipline to be in multi-stages that we should probably all look at this and vote No on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Clayborne, to close. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes. I would just ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 648.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The Senator was closing, Senator Hendon. Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Will the sponsor yield? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Clayborne, is this your first bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

This is -- this is my first bill. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Could -- can you explain to me why you selected Senator Raica as your co-sponsor? That may hurt your changes with this bill here. And I -- I have to join Senator Jacobs. I don't

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

understand, for the life of me, what this bill does or why you're this bill is -- why even pushing something like that. I just can't understand it, Senator and I, you know, I -- I think there'll be a lot of red -- red lights up there, myself.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Any further discussion? Senator Clayborne, to close. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Again, I would ask for the Senate to vote -- give a favorable vote on this bill, because it will assist DCFS and allow them to get other information that is needed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 648 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 648, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 653. Senator Trotter. Out of the record. House Bill 729. Senator Rauschenberger. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 729.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

House Bill 729, has two provisions. The first provision requires, in the future, people -- re-drilling subdivision or personal wells notify their local government of the depth of the well, so it can be recorded. There's been a problem in the suburbs of people drawing off of aquafers in a -- without people

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

understanding who else is on the aquafers. This allows local government to track who's pulling from what level in suburban areas and throughout the State. The second provision of this bill deals with allowing permissive licensing of Illinois laboratories that deal with water quality. It requires the laboratories to pay all their own fees, and is unopposed <sic> by no one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Would the sponsor vield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, you know, we just got through with a first-bill grilling. Senator -- it -- it's your tradition, Senator -- Senator, it's your tradition to pass one bill a year. Already this year you're at about twenty, and you've probably got another ten yet to come. I think it would only be fair if you would share your load with some of your other Members.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. I'm not so sure I'd want to share this one with any of my Members. Let me just ask -- I want to ask a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I live in Bond County, and I -- I live out on the farm, and I want to drill a well in the back yard. Who do I call to get permission?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, it doesn't require permission to drill a well. You'd notify whoever was in charge of your zoning. In the case of the county, you'd notify the county of the depth at which you -- your well went to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Do you think Bond County really is going to care?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

This bill only applies if your local government requires a permit to drill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

So if we have county zoning then that $\operatorname{--}$ that would be a requirement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

If they require a permit to drill a well. If -- if your county does not require a permit to drill a well, this wouldn't apply.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have a question of the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Welch.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Rauschenberger, we passed a bill requiring set backs for wells for basically farms or anybody dealing with pesticides. Does this affect that in any way?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

No, Senator, it doesn't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I -- I welcome Senator Jacobs' comments, and would be very happy to meet with him after Session and discuss him perhaps sponsoring a -- the excess bills that I'm carrying if he's willing. And I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 729 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 1 Nay, and 1 voting Present. House Bill 729, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 753. Senator Maitland. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 753.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

House Bill 753 makes the operator or installer of a private exchange switch responsible for maintaining the same level of 9-1-1 service to subscribers as is provided by all other carriers. The bill, frankly, is intended to shift the responsibility from the local exchange carrier, who has really no effective way to police compliance with this provision, to the installer and operator of -- of the private switch system. This bill passed out of the House 115 to -- to nothing and there was no discussion in committee. I would seek support of the Body, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall House Bill 753 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 753, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 801. Senator Hasara. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 801.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate <sic> Bill 801 simply clarifies that community colleges are units of local government. There evidently has been some confusion about payroll deduction for charitable contributions, and I've been ask to sponsor this bill for them. I'd ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bowles. If there's no

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 801 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 801, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the top of page 7 of your regular Calendar, is House Bills on the Order of 3rd Reading. House Bill 868. Senator Mahar. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 868.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. House Bill 868 requires DCFS to submit to the Governor and General Assembly a written plan for the development of in-state licensed secure child care facilities, that care for children who are in need of secure living arrangements for their health, safety and well-being. DCFS is in support of this. Committee Amendment No. 1 allows for those entities who wish to participate in programs funded by Mental Health, DASA or DCFS to be allowed to do so without regard to their tax status. This is a bill that I sponsored, and passed this Chamber unanimously. I know of no opposition to this and I would ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 868 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 868, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 897. Senator Hawkinson. Out of the record. House Bill 929. Senator Walsh. Out of the record. House Bill 955. Senator Karpiel. House Bill 956. Senator Berman. Senator Berman. Madam Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 956.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate -- House Bill 956 requires the Department of Insurance to administer a program to provide assistance to seniors in insurance related matters. The Department must recruit and train volunteers to provide insurance counseling and education through public forums. The goal will be to provide all seniors access to the program and it's -- it is supported by the Department of Insurance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 956 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 956, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1070. Senator Petka. Senator Petka. House Bill 1116. Senator Dillard. House Bill 1197. Senator DeAngelis. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1197.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1197 permits a church to be located within a hundred feet of property that holds a liquor license. This is a request made by church. It -- it still requires zoning approval, but the authorities may, in fact, adopt this. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1197 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 Ayes, 7 Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1197, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1212. Senator Peterson. House Bill 1268. Senator Hawkinson, House Bill 1322. Senator Dillard. House Bill 1363. Senator Garcia. House Bill 1633. Senator Sieben. House Bill 1653. Senator Hawkinson, Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1653.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the soy ink bill that many of you have asked to be co-sponsors of, and it requires all printing by or for the State to use soybean ink unless the agency

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

determines that another type of ink is required because of quality or cost. We have amended it here in the Senate at the request of CMS, to only require when it's practical. So it wouldn't have to used on certain kinds of hunting stamps and others where it would be impractical to use the soy ink. I think it's an important bill for agriculture. It's -- it's a statement, perhaps symbolic, but also helpful in promoting the use of our ag products. And I would ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this bill. You know, Illinois is the leading soybean producing State in -- in the nation with some huge processing plants at -- at Decatur and -- and Gibson City and around in different places and I think it's fitting that -- that we should pass this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Hawkinson, what is the determination that soybean ink is not the proper type of ink to use for a particular printing purpose? How -- who decides that and based on what criteria?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

The agency -- the agency involved would decide.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

So if the Governor decides he wants to have a full color photo of himself, in an annual report the Governor decides that we will have a full color picture of him regardless of whether soybean ink can or cannot be used?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

No response.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Hawkinson, to close. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I'm just wondering if we're going to continue to have these full color photos from the statewide office holders of -- of themselves sent out with these annual brochures? Is that -- is that to be in soybean ink? If it can't be in soybean ink, why bother having them? Why not just say that all printing must be with soybean based ink?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

I answered your question earlier. That'll be determined by the agency. As a practical matter you cannot have all printings with soybean ink. Some of it is just impractical and the Ag industry, and the sponsors in the House and myself, has agreed that we ought to use it whenever practical, but it can't always be done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Hawkinson, to close. SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think this is an important bill

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

for agriculture. We ought to encourage the use of the corn and soybeans used in Illinois, and I would solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 1653 pass. Those in -those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the
voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill
1653, having received the required constitutional majority, is
declared passed.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

House Bill 1698. Senator Donahue. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1698.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. House Bill 1698 provides that -- or expands the Hospital Lien Act to all hospitals and not just not-for-profit and county hospitals, and I would ask for your support, and be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1698 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1698, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. The top of page 8 of your regular Calendar. House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 1711. Senator Cronin. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1711.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Sorry for the delay here. This is a very important bill. It allows the highway commissioner with the Regional Transportation Authority service area to contract with the RTA for the purchase of public transportation services. This is a bill that was discussed in committee. It received overwhelming support. I know of no opposition to the bill. I'd ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1711 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1711, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1721. Senator Cullerton. Senator -- Senator Cullerton. Out of the record.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

House Bill 1730. Senator Palmer. Out of the record. House Bill 1755. Senator Madigan. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1755.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 1755 represents in legislative form the task force recommendations of the primary care task force that met over a course of couple of years. It creates the Primary Care Medical Education Advisory Committee Act; appoints representatives from the appropriate organizations to work with the universities' medical schools in addressing the problem of primary care or rural care. Basically that's what House Bill 1755 does. I'd be glad to answer any questions on House Bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1755 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 1755, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1790. Senator Madigan. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1790.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 1790, as amended, authorizes the Department of Professional Regulation to be able to deny a license or renewal of a license to a person who has defaulted on a scholarship that has been provided or guaranteed by the Illinois State Student Assistance Commission or any governmental agency of the State. It also continues the practice of funding nursing scholarships through the Nursing Dedicated and Professional Fund. That extends that expiration date of that program. I would be glad to answer any questions on House Bill 1790, as amended, or otherwise ask for its approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill -- Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Does this apply to the other professional people who have defaulted on the scholarship or only to the nurses?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Senator Geo-Karis, it relates to anyone who is regulated or their license is regulated by the Department of Professional Regulation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm very

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

glad to see this bill. It's about time some of these clowns that have taken advantage of the money from the State, pay up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Madigan, to close. SENATOR MADIGAN:

I would just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Question is, shall House Bill 1790 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 1790, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1791. Senator Hasara. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1791.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate -- House Bill 1791 actually does three things. It updates our Statutes to reflect the name changes of State buildings. I can give those to you, the State of Illinois Center, James R. Thompson Center; Rockford Office Building, "Zeke" Giorgi Center; Illinois Children's School and Rehabilitation Center, Illinois Visually Handicapped School, are combined and changed to the Illinois Center for Rehabilitation and Education; Illinois State Psychiatric Institute to Metro Children and Adolescents Center; and Main Township High School North to Suburban North Facility. It also prospectively changes the name of the East St. Louis Regional Building to the Kenneth Hall Regional

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

State Building. And the third thing this bill does is, provides that when the federal rate for mileage reimbursement changes that change will be reflected at the start of the State's next fiscal year instead of immediately. I'd be glad to answer any questions and would ask for favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1791 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1791, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1810. Senator Peterson. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1810.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1810 allows an income tax deduction for health insurance premiums paid by self-employed individuals, members of partnerships and shareholders of Subchapter S corporations. It also grants a deduction to those individuals who are not able to participate in another employers group insurance plan. And finally, gives equal treatment to self employed individuals who must currently pay taxes on income they paid on health insurance premiums. Employees of other businesses already have their health insurance costs treated as a nontaxable expense. Ask for your support of House Bill 1810.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there any discussion? Senator -- Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Peterson, I believe there is a fiscal note or at least a fiscal consequence to this bill. As I understand it, it's something like ten million dollars. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Well, that's the estimate from the Department of Revenue. Economic and Fiscal Commission say they can't determine the cost. So -- and that -- that is based on a premise that a hundred percent of the people would utilize it and a lot of people who are self-employed may be on their spouses health insurance already. So they're taking the worst scenario. We don't think that comes anywhere near what the cost would be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

So is it proper to say that, according to my analysis, those who get a return would really only get sixty-five dollars and ninety-six cents?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Yes. I believe that's the estimate the Department of Revenue has given and as the -- would like to point out, as the federal deduction goes up, which was just -- a congressional bill went through that was signed by the President that allows for a

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

thirty-percent deduction. As that deduction rises, which I understand they're going to increase that, then our liability would go down. So if it's a hundred-percent federal reduction we would have no liability at the State level.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Last Question. You have just lead into my last question. Since this seems to be something that is still being considered and discussed at the federal level, why are we rushing to do it at the State level when there is the possibility that the federal government will, in fact, allow people above the thirty-percent mark where it already is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Well the thirty percent was just signed into law, I believe, this spring. So I would assume we're looking into the future as prospective that -- maybe in the next Session that there'll be a congressional bill to increase the deduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd would like to speak to the bill. Three concerns, and I think we have to remember that this was bill -- Senate Bill 267, very similar to it, that originally was not voted out of the Senate because of many concerns. One that Senator Palmer addressed, was the Revenue note. I have heard numbers from ten million dollars to possibly to nine or nine and a half million dollars. I think with the provider tax that we have with the hospitals, with the fiscal situation that we have in this State, and particularly the Public Health and Welfare Committee,

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

where we have people that have come before us with specific needs. I don't think this is the time to be giving a tax break of almost -- it could be nine or ten million dollars with the revenue stream that we have. The second thing that we have to be aware of that this puts another exemption on what we really would want to have as a simple flat tax in this State. Even the government is talking about a simple flat tax. So this goes into an exemption and could be more of graduated type of a tax which we don't want to have in this State. Third thing is, this is really not a State issue. This is a federal issue. The -- the exemption and the tax break is already being given now at the federal government for thirty percent. That is where it should stay. should lobby the federal government if they would like to have a hundred percent. That would make sense at the federal level. but let's not have this be at the State level. So I would urge a No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. With the last two weeks of the Legislative Session before us, we're all looking for revenue to keep programs that are in existence running. What this bill does is take ten million dollars right out of the budget for the next year. The ten-million-dollar figure is -- is from the -- the State. It's not something made up by some interest group or somebody else trying to kill this bill. This is a estimate of the Department of Revenue. This also sets the precedent that we're going to start having tax exemptions on the State income tax return. We've had several of those that have been defeated in the past. This particular item was defeated twenty-four to seventeen back on March 16th - this same proposal. It was a good idea to vote against it then, even though it's a -- it's a difficult vote,

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

it's -- it's something that would be beneficial. The State cannot afford it. If we're setting priorities, is this really one of the priorities we want to set? Set that above feeding the poor. Set that above Department of Children and Family Service funding. Set that above Correction funding. There are a lot of programs that are more worthy than this one. And I don't think this is the time to pass a ten-million-dollar tax break here in the State of Illinois. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Fawell. SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Eighty-five percent of our businesses now in this State are now owned by -- are -- are -- now are companies that employ twenty-five or less. The growth in any business that we've got in this State, are those small companies. Seems to me we ought to be encouraging small companies to partnerships to be able to start-up, and be able to continue the growth in our economy. This bill will help that small guy - that Ma and Pa group - who we are always talking about and never seem to be able to do anything for. We managed to do for the big corporations. They get a hundred-percent deduction for health insurance. And yet, the poor guy that's -that's -- runs the gas station at the end of the block can't take his health insurance off, unless we pass this bill. It seems to me this is a good bill. We're finally doing something for that small guy who wants to improve, who wants to expand his business, and -- and maybe be able to hire two or three more guys. think we all ought to be on board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I concur

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

with Senator Fawell's remarks. I might add that the small business person is the one who's really, really affected. And we're trying to help out in health care, and how else can we do it if we don't do it this way? At least, this is the least painful and I certainly suggest that we all vote for it. And as far as the Department of Revenue goes they make blat in estimates, ten million, nine million, and they don't even know what they're talking about half the time, on that score. So I ask for a favorable vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Well, you know, actually -- thank you, Mr. President. Actually, this is a savings to the taxpayer in this State, because one of the biggest expenses we have in government today is Medicare, Medicaid and trying to take care of those people that don't have the wherewithal to handle this situation later on in life. Here's an opportunity to let small business people get an opportunity to do, as Senator Geo-Karis and Senator Fawell have said, to participate in a program of their own choosing with their own dollars preparing them for when they retire or need long-term care health. What better program could we provide, really? Instead of the State coming along later on and putting them on the -- on some public dole, paying their premiums, causing problems with Medicare and Medicaid again, it seems like here's an attempt to step in the right direction. We allow it for every large corporation that has a program themselves. These are small business people. This is, I think, a program that will save us money and I sure ask for your support on this important bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise for a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point.

SENATOR BOWLES:

In the gallery behind me, is a group from Senator Clayborne's district, and in his absence I would like to present Sister Thea Bowman School, with Freida Lucky as the Administrator. They're from East St. Louis. Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Will our guests please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Any further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeanGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President, You know. been on this earth for a long time and I've often wondered why the grocer disappeared. Why the corner drugstore disappeared. Why the corner gas station disappeared. The other day, Senator talked about this gas station that had this little bit or -- or this farm land that had this little bit of contamination. I had a gas station person that would actually take the snow off my driveway. That same gas station person would change the oil on my car. That same gas station person would tow me in if something happened to my car. But, you know, those are all disappearing and we all wonder why, as this man disappeared when he had to dig up his oil tank. And I got to tell you why they disappear, because we will not, in fact, support legislation such as this. quite often from, Senator Welch his talk about the little people. How we walk all over the little people. How we trample people. How we refuse to protect the little people. Senator Welch, I never want to hear that from your because your comments are aimed right at the little people. are, in fact, doing the very thing that you are so good at

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

protesting. Let's face it folks. The people that have made this country strong, are the little people. The people who are growing the jobs are the little people. Everyday I read IBM lays off seven thousand, AMOCO lays four thousand, but Chris Lauzen keeps hiring. Let's go with the people that are growing our economy and let's quit discriminating against them, by not allowing to do what every other large company is allowed to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator O'Daniel. SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this bill. You know, the same people that are opposed to this are the ones that are opposed to enterprise zones, TIF districts or anything that will help us with blighted areas or -- or areas that really -- things that really create business in this State. If we don't do things to keep small business going we'll lose more than ten million dollars. It'll -- it'll be very detrimental to -- to small businesses. I think, you know, we do a lot of these for large business concerns and -- and the small businessman's entitled to it also. I support this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger. SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I wasn't going to say anything, but when Aldo stood up and -- when Senator DeAngelis stood up and -- and pointed out that the corner grocer is gone and that there's nobody to change the oil in his car anymore and he has to pump his own gas. I -- I just thought maybe we ought take just a minute and clarify what this bill's about. This bill applies to individual taxpayers who are self-employed, or partners of a partnership, or shareholders in a Sub S corporation. I -- I don't know who changes Aldo's oil.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

don't know who ran his corner grocery store, but I -- I kind of wonder if they were self-employed, taxpayers, or shareholders in Subchapter S. There -- there is an equity argument to make here, but the equity argument belongs at the federal level where the deduction is meaningful. At the State level we have a flat-rate income tax. The purer, simpler and cleaner we keep that, better it is for all taxpayers. If -- if you believe in this kind of thing, I think you ought to encourage your congressman. don't think it ought to be something that we should be mucking in. There's hundreds of good reasons to provide exemptions and deductions on the Illinois State income tax, but if you do, you're going to have to have a fifteen-percent rate and we're going to enter into the same thing that the federal government has begun to realize is perhaps a mistake. I -- I certainly respect Senator DeAngelis, and I -- maybe he's going to rise to explain this, but I want to meet those guys that do his automobile work later. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch, for a second time. SENATOR WELCH:

Well, since -- since I was criticized in the debate, I thought I would try to defend myself, since Senator DeAngelis put words in my mouth. Senator DeAngelis, I didn't say that we're not taking care of the little guy. But really what we're doing is we're taking care of people who are able to form their own businesses. They're in Subchapter S corporations. They are able to take care of themselves. Now, maybe that's just a difference in philosophy between your party and our party. You know, many of us think that -- think of life as sort of like a -- a trip. Like on the old covered wagons going from one coast to the other. There are those on one side who believe that those who can't make the trip -- those who are too feeble or -- or are unable to carry on should be

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

left by the roadside, and the caravan should go on. Some of us believe that we're all in this together. And everybody should remain on that wagon till we get to the other coast. And, Senator DeAngelis, I think that's the difference here. What I have said is this, this is ten million dollars out of the budget that could be used for other programs, such as DCFS, such as individuals who — who are unable to care for themselves, who are unable to work. That's not like saying we're just picking on the small guy. I think it's a totally different philosophy, Senator. And if you're for everybody making the trip from one coast to the other, if you're for everybody pulling in the same wagon, then you would support my position, which is to vote against the special tax break, and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, for a second time. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah. Mr. -- Mr. President, I apologize, but let me clear one thing up. Senator Rauschenberger, you got away with this last time, when this bill came up. You are not going to get away with it again. This bill does not require any changes on the income tax form. And maybe you're not doing any income tax or paying any income tax, but if you'll look there's a space there where you either add back in or deduct income like pension income. Then it will go right in that slot. It is not something the requires a change. It does not require any type of extra work on anybody's part. So let's cut out the stuff that says this bill is going to require additional work in terms of the income tax or a change in that form.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

SENATOR PETERSON:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to state that just as the State is struggling to pay it's health care bills, so are the small men and women who have these businesses. They have their problems. They have their financial concerns also. Small business men and women don't ask the State to pay their bills - their health bills for them. They only ask for equal treatment with the big corporations that are already getting a tax break. Let's think about those people who create more jobs in this State, then any major corporation combined. Let's vote Yes on this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 1810 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 12 Nays, 1 voting Present. And House Bill 1810, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1827. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1827.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill amends the Use Tax Act, the Service Use Tax Act, the Service Occupation Tax Act, and the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act, to exempt items donated to organizations in a disaster area. The bill would exempt from the Sales and Use Tax personal property, as follows: where it's donated by a manufacturer or a retailer in Illinois; is donated for disaster relief; is donated during a State or federally

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

declared disaster period; is donated to an eligible organization that assists victims of the disaster who reside within the declared disaster area. This bill really comes out of the great flood of two years ago. But I think the timing is appropriate, given the events of last weekend in my area, and just a week ago here in this area. And I think it's an important bill supported by the United Way, the Red Cross and many others. I'd like to yield to Senator Syverson, if I might. We have one matter of legislative intent that we need to read into the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purpose of legislative intent, can -- can you expand on what is meant by the infrastructure in 1827?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Infrastructure also means privately held electric and natural gas facilities and distribution systems, sewer and water purification and distribution systems, rail, air or water port facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1827 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1827, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1843. Out of the record. House Bill -- Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise?

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR HENDON:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you very much. In the President's Gallery I want -- I have some constituents of mine here, Mrs. Thomasa Yarrington -- Ms. Thomasa Yarrington, and members of Midwest Chicago Avenue Business Development Association. They are doing some economic development work on Chicago Avenue in my district, which is a very depressed area, and doing wonderful work, they're having a reception today at the Lincoln Plaza Best Western across the street. Everyone is welcome from three to seven. At seven o'clock they're having a presentation and a little party afterwards. We have a full screen for the Bulls so you can see them. And I just wanted us to acknowledge them and give them a hand, welcome to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Will our guests please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. House Bills. House Bill 1868. Senator Hasara. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1868.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1868 codifies current federal law regarding Medicaid reimbursement to federally qualified health centers. We've already been doing this, we're just codifying it. The amendment inserts that there must be

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

federal money before this happens. I'd be glad to answer any questions, and would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1868 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 1868, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1876. Senator Syverson. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1876.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1876 amends the Illinois Insurance Code in dealing with reciprocals, and it's frankly just taking the surplus and giving it to the free-standing medical clinics across Illinois. I know of no objection. It passed unanimously out of the House earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I rise to state some concern on this bill. I'm surprised that there's no objection, Senator, because this has the potential of taking another half-million dollars from the State Pension Fund. All of you know that we've -- we've dealt with the unclaimed property provision over the years. When we've needed more money we tap into the unclaimed

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

property provision and -- and this is -- this is an attempt that, I think, will make our underfunded pension system more underfunded and I just think it's a bad bill. It's my understanding that this is initiated by the State Medical Society and that's fine, but it's just not the right direction to take fiscally, and I would -- I would urge a No vote on this measure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Carroll. SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I join to -rise -- and Senator Severns in opposition because you know, when
we looked at the unclaimed property several years ago. We did
decide that that was a good way to help us meet our obligations to
fund the unfunded liability in pensions. We have sped up, in
fact, the length of time people have to hold unclaimed properties
in order to get more money faster, quicker, easier into this
pension system. If we start carving out exemptions from unclaimed
property giving it to pet ideas, then I think, once again, we're
just dooming the pension funds and opening this up for everyone of
us to come up with an idea of where we think the unclaimed
property funds could be better spent. I think it's a bad road to
be going down. I think it's time to put the brakes on it now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just quickly, this -- this money does not come out of the unclaimed pension fund and if we understand how that works and how it's funded, I think they realize it does not come -- it does not affect the pension funds. This is something that's very important that helps those clinics that deal with those in the State that currently do not have

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

insurance, even to deduct. And we'd ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 1876 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 34 Ayes, 19 Nays, 1 voting Present. And House Bill 1876, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

On page 8 we have Senate Bill -- or House Bill 1893. Senator Lauzen. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1893.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

What House Bill 1893 does is, it codifies an agreement between the Department of Revenue and the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, and it does seven things that are agreed to by both the merchants and the Department of Revenue. I'd be happy to go into the detail, but in interest of time, I'll just answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any questions or any discussion? Any questions? Seeing naught, the question is, shall Senate Bill -- shall House Bill 1893 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? Have all voted who passed the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 1893, having received the required

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Tom Dunn. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. House Bill 1931.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1931.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Tom Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill would do what Senator Dudycz's bill did about two years ago for the Chicago Housing Authority. And it would allow all housing authorities in the State to exclude from income that money that was received for antidrug, anticrime, or other security initiatives, and for the first eighteen months of employment, following a period of six months or more of unemployment, in the determination of rent for individuals who live in public housing, as an attempt to assist those people in getting on their feet and out of public housing. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1931 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 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 1931, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1968. Senator Berman. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1968.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill does what the Calendar says that it does. It adds social workers as trained intervenors under the Alcoholism and Drug Intervenor and Reporter Immunity Law. It will expand the availability of persons to treat alcohol and drug abuse problems. I solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1968 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 57 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 1968, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Raica, on —on House Bill 1977. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1977.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1977 requires hospitals and other facilities in the State to report each injury allegedly caused by a violent act. It requires the Department of Public Health to -- to coordinate those reporting and existing reporting requirements and provides for confidentiality of the information. This was agreed to. There is no known opposition at this time. I just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Collins. Further discussion? If not,

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

the question is, shall House Bill 1977 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 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 1977, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Karpiel, on House Bill 2123. Do you wish leave of the Body to return House Bill 2123 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2123. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Actually, the amendment -Amendment 1 basically becomes the bill. It changes the -- the
hundred and twenty percent of the Statewide mean for IGAP tests as
the indicator of which schools would be exempt from the -- for two
years, dealing with the improvement plan. I can explain the
entire amendment, but I could do that on 3rd Reading as well. If
you have it -- do you want...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

I would ask the Body if there's any discussion. Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator O'Daniel, on House Bill 2138. Madam

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2138.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate <sic> Bill 2138 is legislation that both the Department of Mines and Minerals and the Illinois Oil and Gas Association recommended and -- and are supporting. It saves the Department of Mines money as -- as postage, going from certified mail to first class mail on resubmitting permits and things of this It'll -- it'll save them about six thousand dollars, and also they're -- they're going to charge an additional hundred dollars to re-permit for drilling a hole or going in and working over a hole or something of this nature and that'll generate them about another ten thousand. It also is beneficial to the Illinois Oil and Gas Association. It only requires fifty-one percent of the investors to okay -- to -- to pull a well or plug the well or something, where normally it -- it did take sixty percent and it's really hard to locate all these -- these -- these interest holders in -- in these oil wells, especially downstate. I think it's beneficial to both Mines and Minerals and the Illinois Oil and Gas Association. If there's any questions, I'll attempt to answer them. If not, I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2138 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

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2138, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2177. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. House Bill 2204. Senator Raica. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2204.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill provides that all identification cards are subject to provisions of the -- of Including ID cards issued by the State and federal governments. Currently, the Secretary of State's Office can take actions against someone from the State of Illinois who fraudulently goes out and -- and advertises that he can issue and -- and -- and make -- furnish ID cards -- phony ID cards. We're not allowed, at this point in time, to take any action against any fraudulent ID cards printed outside the State of Illinois that may be used inside the State of Illinois. This just expands the law to allow us to do that from the Secretary of State's Office. There's no known opposition. It's supported by the Illinois State Police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2204 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 57 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2204, having received the required

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2278. Senator Parker. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. Oh, I'm sorry. I overlooked Senator Welch. House Bill 2273. Senator Welch, would you like to have this bill read? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2273.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill arises out of a situation in a county in my district in which a child under twelve years old was accused of raping another student in the same small school. The student, after being on probation for awhile, was admitted back to the same school and everybody in the school was very upset because the student who was raped had to go to -- continue going to the same school with the person who was the accused, another student. What this bill allows to happen is for the school board to send the offending student to another school district or alternative education program. And it allows for the families to have the children separated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Dudycz. SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I have a few questions of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Welch, my analysis says that this authorizes the

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

school entities to admit into the alternative education programs, persons who have been convicted of a felony, and who have either completed their sentences or been paroled, placed on mandatory supervised release, pardoned or placed on probation or conditional discharge. Who wants this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

The School Board of Putnam County and the parents of the child who was raped want it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, your -- your bill refers to an approved alternative education programs. Who approves these programs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

These are State approved programs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So the State Superintendent would approve the programs. Do they -- these are programs which are funded by the State, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

They are funded by the local school districts.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

...(machine cutoff)...saying that there is no State money funding these programs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Only to the extent that local school districts are funded by the State, Senator. So, obviously, there are -- there are State funds involved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So since there are State funds, how much money was appropriated by the State last year for these alternative education programs, if you know?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

That is the function of the local school district to appropriate that for their own programs, is my understanding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, it's my understanding that there was about 17.4 million dollars spent, and that served about thirty-five thousand students. Do you know how many students in the State currently could use alternative education programs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I don't have a figure on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, then let me tell you. During the 1993 or '94 school years, the public schools reported thirty-eight thousand nine hundred drop-outs and over one hundred and fifty thousand truants. And these are the kind of kids that should be benefiting from these alternative programs. Under the existing State program we're only serving approximately thirty-five thousand. Leaving over one hundred and fifty thousand children needing programs, but not having access to them. So under your bill, you're expanding a program that cannot even meet the needs of the students that we have now. Isn't that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well -- well, you know, Senator, wouldn't some of these convicted felons that would have access to these educational programs, wouldn't -- have -- they have had access to them within our correctional system in the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

This is -- that would be up to the school board. If the school board would let them in. This is based on a consensual agreement between one school and -- and another.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So -- so this is -- this bill is permissive. But under your

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

bill, Senator, if a convicted felon, for example, some sort of a gang member who broke into a senior citizen's home, could be admitted to an alternative program ahead of a -- of a kid who kept his nose clean, but who dropped of school at the age of seventeen to go to work. I think that there is no explicit prohibition against this bill -- against such people being admitted to an alternative education program, now. I don't think this bill is necessary. I don't think we should support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Shaw. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator, I don't have the bill in front of me, is this a permissive bill or is it "they shall"?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No. It's not a shell bill. It's a specific bill -- oh, did you say "shall" not shell? This is a specific bill. It's not a shell bill. It says "may be awarded under this Section". It's a permissive piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

If -- if there is a school district that has an alternative program, and -- and -- and I happen to have one in my county, for what we call behavior disordered emotionally disturbed kids who are frankly, on the verge of becoming juvenile delinquents quite often, for a lot reasons. Would my superintendent -- regional

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

superintendent of school have to take these kids that came back from St. Charles, for instance, and put them in this program or would he have the option of refusing them admittance?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No, they do not. They are authorized if they want to do it. They probably would not want to do it, I wouldn't think.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Welch, while I can understand, in your district, you may have an issue with a twelve year old, up in my districts they have a lot of concerns and problems with keeping convicted gang members out of our high school programs. And I guess, in -- in -- in your opinion, is there any danger that a bill like this might be presumptive evidence to allow those convicted felons, that some of my school districts would like to keep out of educational programs, could it be presumptive evidence or -- or at least lean toward legislative intent to show that perhaps that those people had a right to be included in alternative education or regular education programs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

This creates no additional rights on behalf of anyone. What it does is, it allows for a school board to admit to a program these people. They -- they can admit. They don't have to admit. They're not forced to admit. They may, if they want to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

I -- I guess, Senator, I'll ask a question that I think Senator Dudycz asked, our analysis leads us to believe that there's currently no explicit prohibition from this taking place anyway. So that's why I'm concerned about the fact that it might demonstrate legislative intent. Just my last question... If this -- if there is no prohibition currently, why do we need this bill? And -- and by passing this bill, I'm concerned -- just so you understand that it may effect what's going on in my districts, in trying to prevent gang re-infiltration of our high schools. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

This bill is not intended to create any additional rights. The school board involved doesn't believe it has the authority, so they have been reluctant to transfer the student out of the district. The district that the student should be going to school in will pay the cost of sending the student to another district. So, no, it doesn't create any additional rights.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, Senator Welch, to close.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I think this bill is just to clarify an existing situation to give the schools the authority to make sure that they can transfer students. The cost of the student goes with them. It's totally permissive. A school can except a child if they want. They don't have to do it. So I think that this bill basically, is a clarification, more than a major change, in State policy. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall House Bill 2273 pass. All those in

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 26 voting Yes, 25 voting No, 1 voting Present. House Bill 2273, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Parker, on House Bill 2278. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2278.

(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 -- House Bill 2278 simply amends the Law Enforcement Officers, Civil Defense Workers, Civil Air Patrol Members, Paramedics, Firemen and State Employers <sic> Compensation Act. It increases the compensation for death in the line of duty from fifty thousand to a hundred thousand dollars. An increase is provided about every ten years. The last was provided in 1983. This passed out of the House with no opposition. It was an agreed bill in the Insurance and Pensions Committee. I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2278 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2278, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Madigan, on

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

House Bill 2231 <sic> (2331). Madam -- excuse me. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2331.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 2331 is a Department of Insurance administration bill, which makes numerous changes in the Insurance Code. I'll be glad to answer any questions on House Bill 2331, and would otherwise ask for its approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2331 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2331, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Butler. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2334.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2334 essentially codifies existing practice. It provides language also

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

to conform with federal regulations. Basically, it creates the HOME Investment Trust Act -- Trust Fund Act, which permits the Governor to designate the Illinois Housing Development Authority to act -- to act on behalf of the State with regard to the HOME program. The HOME program, as you know, is the -- is the federal low-income housing program. So this bill, essentially, allows Illinois to conform with federal regulations. I ask your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, shall House Bill 2334 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2334, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2339. Senator Parker. Madam -- Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2339.

(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. House Bill 2339 simply requires a rental car company to rent a vehicle to a designated driver of a nondriving person with a disability. This does not put any additional burden on the rental car companies. The designated driver would have to meet the same requirements which other persons renting vehicles must meet. The rental car companies have no problems with this bill. And this was -- there was no opposition in the House, and it

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

passed out of committee with no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. Senator, just one question, if she would yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she will yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator Parker, in -- in the debate we did discuss, and as you indicated, the car rental people are not opposed to this legislation, but we did raise the question about liability. We know that this person is, in fact, renting the car and someone else is going to drive it. But what would happen -- and that was the question we raised: Who would be liable if that person did decide to -- to drive that car, even though they may be not able to? What would happen and who would be liable? I think we -- we asked that question. I don't know if you were able to find out an answer to that or not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

I thought the understanding was that it would be the same as if, you know, an able-bodied person had rented the car and then had somebody else drive it. Certainly the person who was renting the actual car should be liable for that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

My question is, and I think it's where we probably had our hang up a little bit: What would be the responsibility and -- and the legal responsibility if that driver would happen to drive it and come back and say, "Hey, you rented this vehicle to me knowing

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

full well that I can't see and I chose to drive it"? Who's responsible?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

I'm not sure if I understand your question. Are you saying if the designated driver were to get in an accident and then all of a sudden he says, I'm not liable? Who are you saying?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

What I'm saying is, the blind person, or maybe legally blind but not totally blind, comes to rent this vehicle, that he or she then, instead of having a designated driver drive that vehicle, he or she, who is legally blind, decides to drive that vehicle. Who's liable?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

The person who rents the car would still be liable. It shouldn't be any different if a person is blind or legally blind and decides to drive the car, as if somebody else, even if they can see, drives it and has an accident.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'm not going to belabor it, because I understand the intent of the law. But maybe someone out there could -- could explain it to me afterwards, some attorney that could -- could show me how a car rental could rent a vehicle to a blind person, and if that blind person drove that vehicle, how the car rental could not be held liable for allowing a blind person to drive a car. But I'm

50th Legislative Day

SENATOR PARKER:

May 16, 1995

not going to belabor it, that's just a question I wanted answered. So if -- maybe one of your legal eagles could explain it afterwards, I'd appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any further discussion? Further discussion? If not, Senator Parker, would you like to close?

I -- I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall House Bill 2339 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2239, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2349. Senator Burzynski. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2349.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Basically, this is a bill to clarify a three-year time span for -- in the Nursing Act provide that person -- people who fail to pass the examination within three years will have to go back and get additional education. There's also another provision on this particular piece of legislation, Committee Amendment No. 2, which is a -- an amendment that is coming from Senator Cullerton, if he'd like to explain that provision of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill is supported by the -- this amendment is supported by the Secretary of State and the Medical Society. It would allow a doctor or a nurse who treats a person who is alcohol or impaired who was an accident victim, or as I would say, a crash victim, they could -- they would be allowed to notify the police of the driver's blood alcohol or drug content. Current law regarding confidentially would subject a doctor who notifies the police to possible civil liability. This comes physician who had asked that he, along with other physicians, be allowed to report to law enforcement agencies, this information. And this language was drafted, and amended, with approval of the -- and cooperation with the attorneys with the Medical Society. So I'll be happy to answer any questions with this -- regarding this portion of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The original bill does not disturb me. It's -- reluctantly I stand in opposition to Senator Cullerton's amendment on this bill. I think it's important for us to recognize that what we are doing here is to give a -- legal permission for a doctor to violate the -- the physician-patient relationship. And I say that -- and I'm -- I'm upset - and I they're listening - I'm upset with the Medical Society that would support this amendment. I thought the Medical Society and doctors should stress their ethical obligation to maintain the confidentiality between a patient and their doctor. Regardless of what I do, and I go into that doctor's office, whatever -whatever disease I may have, whatever short coming I have

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

physically or mentally, that's between me and my doctor. It's the same as when a client walks into my office as their lawyer. cannot divulge anything that that client tells me. And it's the same with the -- with the clergymen. There's only three pure confidentiality relationships. Doctor, lawyer and clergymen. are being asked here to say that if a doctor who's treating you, in an emergency room, smells alcohol he can blow the whistle I've got to tell you, that may sound good from a law and you. order point of view, but it's outrageous from the classical relationship between a patient and a doctor. I don't think it should be in there. I want my doctor to have undivided lovalty to me as his or her patient. I do it as a lawyer. They should do it as a doctor. That's what bothers me about the amendment. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Burzynski, to close. SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. I certainly appreciate the comments made by Senator Berman. I stated that in committee. I understand his concerns about confidentiality on the amendment. I, personally, support the amendment. I think it does a lot of good things and certainly it relieves the pressure that some physicians might feel a moral obligation to report. I would also point out, though, that this is just relative to auto-related incidents and it does not -- and also that a blood test would have to be required before the person could report that out of committee -- or out of the -- out of their observations. So I would move, and certainly appreciate any kind of -- or a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall House Bill 2349 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 voting -beg your pardon, there are 40 voting Yes, 10 voting No, 2 voting
Present. House Bill 2349, having received the required
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator -- Senator
Hasara, on House Bill 2401. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2401.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 2401 does three things. First of all, it provides services to local agencies upon request through an intergovernmental agreement and the Department of State Police would be able to charge actual costs for those services. It provides for a hundred-and-fifty-dollar fine for a convicted offender of a DUI when State Police lab costs are involved in -- in the DUI conviction. It's my understanding that only about five percent of the DUI cases would require this fine. And lastly, it creates the State Police Vehicle Fund for the purpose of depositing the proceeds from the sale of State Police vehicles. CMS would receive a five-hundred-dollar handling fee and the rest would go into the Vehicle Fund for the State Police to replace cars on a regular basis. Be glad to answer any questions and would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she will yield, Senator Syverson.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I'm concerned about the part of the bill that's Operation Kickstart, which that -- that bill was defeated in State Government earlier, a couple of weeks ago, because of some of the questions regarding the -- the cost of that program. Can you tell me -- I guess, first question is this -- is this a mandated program or is this a "may implement"?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Senator, I know the State Police does plan to implement the program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Then I think we need to be careful and look at the cost of this. Operation Kickstart would require then, if it's a mandate, would require that the -- that we replace every single State Police car at fifty thousand miles or less and I think everyone should understand that. Replacing them at fifty thousand miles or less. The cost of -- of replacing over two thousand State Police cars, at this point, is very expensive and I think we need to take a little closer look at the numbers. I know they talk about the -- the resale of -- of -- of reselling the car if they -- if it only has fifty thousand miles, but I'm concerned that right now we don't have the -- the revenue to implement such an expensive program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Raica. Further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor yield for

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Yes. The sponsor indicates she will yield, Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Hasara, under Operation Kickstart the Department expects to trade cars in at around fifty thousand miles. Do you recall yesterday in the Appropriation Committee about how many miles per year the State Police Director mentioned that they annually operate a car?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

No, I don't remember that from yesterday's meeting, but I do know that over half of the vehicles that the State Police now is using have over a hundred thousand miles.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

This -- the Department of State Police Director testified, and my recollection is, that they put about forty thousand miles a year on a car. So Operation Kickstart might actually allow trade in of these cars in fourteen to eighteen months. Now, while a lot of mileage is -- is a problem, particularly for city driving, for the most part, I think our State Police operate mostly on highways and interstates. So their mileage is -- is not exactly the same as the CMS Director's mileage might be. Another question of the sponsor though. Under -- under the normal appropriation process does the State of Illinois provide for replacement of State Police cars currently?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

SENATOR HASARA:

Well, as things stand now, as you know Senator, the State Police comes in with its budget ever year and asks for the replacement of so many cars. I will, however, though, remind you that even with the State Police Vehicle Fund, if this bill passes, the money still must be appropriated by the General Assembly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Then since all we would really be doing is moving this money into a special account and allowing them to keep in their trade-in values and turn their cars over earlier, in essence, some people might -- would you agree -- would have -- might give you the opinion that the State Police are trying to transfer into a special fund, so there's less scrutiny, and so that they can more easily make the decision with less supervision?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Some people might look on it that way, Senator, but certainly it would be up to us to make sure that that didn't happen. If we wanted to maintain control over the State Police cars, we could do so. I might also add that I do have information from the State Police that show that — that they project that they will actually save money under this program for a few reasons. First of all, by — by selling the cars with lower mileage there are small units of local government who do not travel as much as the State Police who can buy the cars with much higher mileage than the State Police would want to do so. So the State Police can sell the cars for a greater price than, obviously, they can now with mileage over a hundred thousand dollars <sic>. The other costs that they figure into their projection is a cost savings, obviously, of

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

maintenance, because it costs a lot more to maintain a car with over a hundred thousand miles than a car with under fifty thousand miles. So while I recognize that the program is somewhat controversial, I do have information from the State Police that shows in the long run this saves money and it also provides the State Police with cars that are in much better shape than the ones they have now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, I would like to thank the sponsor for answering questions and I -- I appreciate that. And I would just point out to the other Members that any time the State Police had a program for turning their cars over more frequently, they could bring that to the Bureau of the Budget in the appropriations process. I -- I just guess I'm just concerned about creating a special fund. Soon after this, I fear you'll have other departments here asking for special funds and having their vehicles treated separately. But I certainly think we're all interested in making sure the State Police have safe cars and just commend thoughtful consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. It's not too often that I'd -- I'd rise in support of this -- this bill and the amendment on this bill in 2401. It's not too often, while I agree with the State Police and I don't think that -- there's been years when I wanted to stop the new squad cars purchase then for -- for all -- all -- I want to stop all squad cars completely in the -- in the State of Illinois. But, Operation Kickstart is a good program. It's worked in other

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

states. We are here to be fiscally responsible. We're here to worry about the taxpayer dollars. But under this -- under this program there'd be new squad cars on a more regular basis. And I -- and I say to each and every one of you in this room, you know when you're dialing 9-1-1, when it comes to a life or to an accident on I-55 or a truck overturned, and you need an emergency vehicle on that scene, you want a car that's running and operating properly. Fifty, sixty thousand miles is a lot of miles for a car that runs twenty-four hours a day. That car isn't driven up and down I-55, it's idling for four or five hours a day. We can sell these cars to the local police departments. We can turn money over. Last year alone in the State of Illinois, we sold two hundred and thirty some squad cars and got almost a half a million dollars back. We got to replenish these squad cars, put new squad cars on the street. Believe me -- and if anybody's ever dialed 9-1-1, and I hope that nobody ever has to in this Chamber, you want a vehicle, you want a response emergency vehicle on the scene immediately. I rise in strong support of 2401.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you -- I -- it's not often that I get applause before I speak. I guess I have the same concerns that Senator Rauschenberger has just expressed, and that is that what we are doing here, as a matter of public policy, we are now affording one agency of government the opportunity to sell their -- their cars and keep their money. Seems to me, Senator Rauschenberger, that this may end up working like school aid and the Lottery. That all of a sudden people think that the Lottery is going to be in addition to the budget except that we subtract the Lottery figures from the -- from the figure and they end up not making very much money. But however, I think it's a -- a matter of -- of concern.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Let me ask this question. Senator Hasara, if, in fact, a school district wishes to have State Police administer, on a voluntary basis, a Breathalyzer exam during prom night. Would they then now be in a position to have to negotiate -- negotiate a contract so that they could reimburse the State Police for the services? Is that -- is that what we're doing in this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

They could, Senator. They -- there may be no reimbursement. They may just want an agreement with the school district. They could ask them to be reimbursed, if they so chose to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Under what conditions and criteria then, would there -- would the State Police then enter into negotiations for reimbursement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Any time they provide a service to another unit of government, they may negotiate an inter-cooperation agreement with that agency.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I'm -- I'm happy to hear the answers to several of these questions. Number one, I was concerned at first when this was considered in another committee, the amendment as far as Operation Kickstart, my main concern was the safety issue for our State Police Officers. Now, I recognize from the answers from the sponsor that we no longer have those

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

safety concerns with these cars, because we wouldn't be selling cars to local government if there was that danger issue. W۵ certainly wouldn't want to sell our danger to another form of government -- or another area of government. Number two, I'd like to repeat that this amendment was considered in State Government Operations. The information was brought from the State Police and was considered and then defeated. If our objective is to our constituents would ask us to use our common sense and which one of us would say that we would save money turning over cars every forty to fifty thousand miles when we usually change tires, versus -- so we -- what we're proposing is that saving money driving two cars in a three-year period of time rather than one car in a three-year period. This was defeated for good reason in a different committee. I suggest a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. You know, we're often asked to run government like a business. Let me tell you that business I have ever run, operated on the basis of -- of the State Police forces do on their cars, I think somebody would have I think we're guilty of trying to micromanage here. It seems to me this is an effort on the part of an agency to -- to establish a revolving fund, so that they can turn over cars more frequently, that maintenance costs will go down and resale costs will go up. I don't see this is any dire plot that is going to cost the taxpayer millions of dollars. I think over time, and the State Police stressed that, this is a program of -- of three or four years, until they get that revolving fund established. from that point on there will be a savings. So. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's not micromanage. Let's try to encourage agencies to be a little innovative, if in the long run they can show us a

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

savings. And, I think in this case, I was convinced in committee there is a savings. So I would urge a -- an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Will this -- is this legislation -- is the intent also going to include for the State Police to contract for Police services with small communities?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Senator, if a unit of local government asks the State Police to come in then they would discuss that. But it has to be initiated from the unit of local government.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Well, I think -- I have a little problem with that, because the sheriff's have been providing that type of service for years throughout the State to -- to small towns. And I think we're going to get into the competing business, for competing for police services, and I don't think that's a good idea. So, how about if a local police department calls the State Police for a backup. I would hope that you're not thinking of charging them for a backup? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

I'm -- the State Police provide backup all the time, Senator,

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

as you know, and I'm -- no they would not want to charge for that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Raica. SENATOR RAICA:

I just want it for intent, $\operatorname{Mr.}$ President, if I may. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Hasara, I know it says that - at least the way I read it - that the State Police will receive compensation or a certain amount of money for services which they provide to a municipality. My question would be a lot of State Police districts do not have a -- their own station within the jurisdiction which they -- which they have a -- a beat car in. An example would be, if a trooper's on I-55 and decides to use say the Justice Police Department, and the Summit Police Department for booking purposes of a DUI, does that mean now that they -- let's just say those two communities wanted to have the State Police come in and have some type of an agreement with them, but let's use the reverse. Do the State Police now have to use these -- or use on example that I stated where they need to use a police facility for booking, for fingerprints, for photo, for the Breathalyzer? Would they now be actually paying that local municipality for using their departments also?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

They could, Senator, under this bill it provides for intergovernmental agreement and that would be one example in which you might have that kind of an agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

But Karen, basically, what we're saying is that that agreement could either be one of a monetary value or one of manpower, so long as there's an agreement worked out between agency and -- and local unit of government. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

That's correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Ralph Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

We were talking about furnishing services to communities, are we still furnishing State Police in East St. Louis?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

I believe we still are, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you. I -- I didn't know if Senator Clayborne was aware -- aware of the fact that this might mean that East St. Louis would have to spend part of their money paying the State Police to patrol their city. Would that be correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Under this bill they could Senator, but I doubt that they will. There are not required to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Ralph Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

I -- I would think a little bit might be the reverse. If they -- if they can do it, they probably will. I would think that they -- well that'd be my idea about it. And I wondered also -- DUI -- I think the people that run the DUI machines around the State are employees of the Department of Public Health. Isn't that right, rather than the State Police?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

It depends, Senator. There are local crime labs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I'd rise in support of Senate Bill 2401. And -- although this bill has three components in it, the bill I had, which does -- which did the component number one which established that revolving fund, I was unsuccessful getting that out of committee. But I will tell you, the sponsor of this bill is a heck of a lot better sponsor than who the State Police had on the other bill. And so, Senator Hasara, I wish you the best of luck, better luck than I had. But I think the committee probably didn't see some of the information why the State Police feel that this is an important part of -- of this bill. As you get over a hundred thousand miles on these State Police cars, and as Senator Hasara mentioned, almost one-half of our fleet today

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

has over a hundred thousand miles. The maintenance cost goes up just astronomically into several thousand dollars a year, when you get over a hundred thousand miles. We're far better off if we can trade those cars at fifty to sixty thousand miles. It's going to take at least five years, in my opinion, for this -- if this bill passes for the that revolving fund to generate enough money in the resale or the -- yes the resale of these older cars to generate enough money to be able to do much good at all. But I certainly think it's a step in the right direction that, hopefully, we can begin to decrease the amount of mileage on -- on our State Police cars. And I'd urge support on the bill.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

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

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer Senator Dunn's question, no, the -- there's not an active patrol as it used to be in East St. Louis. We have hired over thirty policemen in the last year and a half. So -- so that shouldn't affect how you vote on this, Senator Dunn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Hasara, to close. SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do realize that Operation Kickstart has been controversial. I'd like to make just a few points for you to consider before you vote. First of all, there

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

mileage mentioned in the bill. So, while evidently the police have talked about trading cars at fifty thousand miles, the Illinois General Assembly certainly still has the authority over the appropriations process, and if you think fifty is too low then you would have the authority to -- to say that, because it is not talked about at all in the bill. Secondly, one Senator about the fact that we would sell unsafe cars to local governments. As I mentioned in my explanation of the bill, many small communities would like having cars with over fifty thousand miles. They are not driving the distances. They are simply staying within their corporate limits, which in many cases, you have town of a couple thousand people and they would relish the opportunity to buy these cars that would serve them for a few years at a lower cost. I would ask for a favorable roll call. And again, I do have figures from the State Police that -- that show that you can sell the cars at a much higher cost then they are now getting and you're saving a lot of money from the maintenance, compared to the maintenance of a car over a hundred thousand miles. So again, I hope you will consider voting Yes on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall House Bill 2401 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 26 voting Yes, 32 voting No, 1 voting Present. House Bill 2401, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Hasara.

SENATOR HASARA:

Ask for Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2407. Out of the record.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

House Bill 2419. Senator Parker. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2419.

(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 simply amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois and the Illinois Act on Aging. It changes the name of the Technical Advisory Committee on Aging to the Coordinating Committee of State Agencies Serving Older People <sic>. The reason this request was made, because this title more clearly identifies the purpose of the committee and its relationship to the Department on Aging. I would be glad to answer questions, and ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2419 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 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. House Bill 2419, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2429. Senator Rauschenberger. Out of the record. We have successfully concluded 3rd Reading House Bills. The -- Senator Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Proceed with your announcement.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Upon adjournment, the Senate Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities will meet in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAICA:

Same motion, Mr. President. That immediately following adjournment that Public Health and Welfare will meet in A-1 in the Stratton Building.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

We will now proceed to page 14 on the Calendar. Secretary's Desk, Concurrence - Senate Bills. Senate Bill 19. Senator O'Malley. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 19, with House Amendment No. 51.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 51 to Senate Bill 19.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Would -- would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Did -- did you say House Amendment No. 51? Could you just -- what -- what was so wrong about this? You know, if you put it in conference committee you might jeopardize the entire bill, which I supported.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

What is wrong with the amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Cullerton, thank you for trying to clarify what No. 51 might be. As I understand it, that is the amendment that survived over there, as hard as that may seem that there were fifty previous amendments offered. But what 51 does, is basically take Senate Bill 19 and make it the House version of Charter Schools. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator O'Malley moves to non-concur in House Amendments -- Senator Jones. Senator Demuzio. Would one of you like to speak? Senator Jones. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Let me ask you a question. Do we -- do we have any information as to what this amendment even is? There's nothing on my desk. I don't have a non-concurrence book. I don't have a concurrence book. We don't have the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Demuzio, to respond again, I think Senator Cullerton asked a question and in responding to it I tried to clarify it. If you'll recall, we had Senate Bill 19 before us at one time, and what it was is the Senate version of Charter Schools. The amendment takes — this Amendment 51 takes it to be the House version of Charter Schools. I'm moving to non-concur to that particular amendment.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

If we're going to go through this order of business, it seems to me that the Membership, at least, ought to have on their desk the knowledge of what these amendments are. We have absolutely nothing on our desk to indicate that this amendment is as Senator O'Malley described. I don't quarrel with the fact that that's probably an accurate description, but I don't have anything on my desk to read. And if we're going to go through the rest of this Calendar, seems to me we ought to just stand in Recess for a few moments and pass out the information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. In the same response, and one of the things this amendment came over late last evening and has not been distributed to Membership. The sponsor of the bill would like to non-concur. But I would think that -- I would assume that these amendments and -- from the House would be distributed, wherein the Membership can vote intelligently on what they are doing. We may like the amendment. The Members on your side may like the amendment. So rather than do that, why don't you just kindly take it out of the record until such time that Members on both sides of the aisle know what they are voting on. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jones, this is a motion. This is not the bill. Senator O'Malley moves to non-concur in House Amendment 51 to Senate Bill 19. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Roll call has been requested. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

On that question, there are 33 voting Yes, 26 voting No, no voting Present. The motion carries and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: Committee on Agriculture and Conservation - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 43. and House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 448; referred to the Committee on Environment and Energy - Senate Joint Resolution 49. House Joint Resolution 6. motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 789, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 481 -- or 41 that Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 544, and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 929: referred the Committee on Executive -Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1498; to the Committee on Financial Institutions - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 Senate Bill 440; to the Committee on Judiciary - motion to concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 428; to the Committee Local Government and Elections - Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 197, and Amendment 1 to House Bill 1108: to the Committee Public Health and Welfare - Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5, Amendment -- Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1363; the Committee on Revenue - Senate Amendment 7, 8, 9 and 10 to House Bill 1212; to the Committee on State Government Operations the motion to concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill and Be Approved for Consideration - motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 14, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 567, and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 597.

Senator Hawkinson, Chair of the Committee on Judiciary, reports House Bills 16, 36, 40, 113, 153, 355, 497, 652, 1069, 1237, 1248, 1654, 1662, 1706, 1708, 1741, 1792, 1797, 2236 and 2338 Do Pass. House Bills 160, 301, 314, 589, 741, 865, 1023,

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

1246, 1437, 1816, 1891, 1910 and 2317 Do Pass, as Amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Messages, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Message for the Governor by Mark Boozell, Director of Legislative Affairs.

Mr. President - the Governor directs me to lay before the Senate the following Message:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate, 89th General Assembly - I have nominated and appointed the following named persons to the offices enumerated below, and respectfully ask concurrence in and confirmation of these appointments of your Honorable Body.

Filed May 16th, 1995.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, have there been any motions filed?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Yes. Senator Barkhausen has filed a motion with respect to House Bill 2205.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, the Chair requests that these motions be printed on the Calendar. So ordered. Messages.

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the Secretary of State.

To the Honorable Members of the Senate, 89th General Assembly - I have nominated and appointed the following named person to the office enumerated below and respectfully ask concurrence in and confirmation of this appointment by your Honorable Body.

Dated, May 16th, 1995

Respectfully, George H. Ryan, Secretary of State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

50th Legislative Day

May 16, 1995

Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Karpiel moves that the Senate stands adjourned until .
11 a.m., Wednesday, May 17th.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

, ·, P

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

96/09/11 16:18:36

MAY 16, 1995

HB-0003	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0008	THIRD READING		10
		PAGE	
HB-0119	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
HB-0166	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
HB-0185	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
HB-0211		PAGE	5
HB-0249	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-0315	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-0413	THIRD READING	PAGE	
			13
HB-0447	THIRD READING	PAGE	25
HB-0471	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-0513	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-0567	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
HB-0598	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-0603	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
HB-0614	THIRD READING		
		PAGE	31
HB-0632	RECALLED	PAGE	32
HB-0648	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
HB-0760	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-0801	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
	THIRD READING	PAGE	42
HB-0956	THIRD READING	PAGE	43
HB-0988	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING		43
		PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-1320	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HR-1398	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
HB-1653	THIRD READING	PAGE	44
	THIRD READING	PAGE	47
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
HB-1711	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
HB-1755	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
HB-1791	THIRD READING	PAGE	51
HB-1810	THIRD READING	PAGE	52
HB-1827	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	64
HB-1876	THIRD READING	PAGE	65
HB-1893	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
HB-1931	THIRD READING	PAGE	68
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
HB-1968	THIRD READING	PAGE	68
HB-1977	THIRD READING	PAGE	69
	RECALLED	PAGE	70
HB-2138	THIRD READING	PAGE	70
HB-2204	THIRD READING	PAGE	72
	MOTION FILED	PAGE	107
HB-2273	THIRD READING	PAGE	73
HB-2278	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
HB-2331	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
HB-2334	THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-2339	THIRD READING	PAGE	82
HB-2349	THIRD READING	PAGE	85
HB-2401	THIRD READING	PAGE	88
	THIRD READING	PAGE	102
SB-0019			
35-0019	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

96/09/11 16:18:36

MAY 16, 1995

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-THE REVEREND ROGER A. RUHMAN	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - APPROVED	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - POSTPONED	PAGE	1
INTRODUCTION OF GUEST-SENATOR WOODYARD	PAGE	2
GUEST SPEAKER-CONSUL GENERAL HUANE	PAGE	3
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	3
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	106
MESSAGE FOR THE GOVERNOR	PAGE	107
MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE	PAGE	107
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	108