54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 89th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks. Will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer today will be given by Senator Adeline Jay Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

(Prayer by Senator Geo-Karis)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

You please all 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 Monday, May 15th; Tuesday, May 16th and Wednesday, May 17th, 1995.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr...(microphone cutoff)...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 Journal just read. There being no objection, so ordered. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Thursday, May 18th and Friday, May 19th, in the year 1995, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 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.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We're going to proceed shortly on the Order of 2nd Reading, and we would appreciate it if anyone is outside of the Assembly of the Senate, to please come in here and let's get the people's business done. 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 passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 384, 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 1 to Senate Bill 384.

We have a like Message on the following Senate Bills with House Amendments:

447 with Amendment 1; 509 with Amendments 1 and 2; 540 with Amendment 1; and 629 with Amendment 1.

All passed the House, May 18th, 1995.

We have a like Message on the following Senate Bills with House Amendments:

46 with Amendment 1; 79 with Amendments 1, 2 and 3; 141 with Amendment 1; 150 with Amendment 4; 164 with Amendment 3; and 741 with Amendment 3.

All passed the House on May 19th, 1995.

We have another Message on the following Senate Bills with House Amendments:

130 with House Amendments 4, 5 6 and 7; 169 with Amendment 1; 231 with Amendments 1 and 2; 265 with Amendment 4;

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

with Amendment 2; 435 with Amendment 1; 443 with Amendments 1 and 2; 619 with Amendment 1; 721 with Amendments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, (11), 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16; 842 with Amendments 1 and 2, and 925 with Amendment 1. (Amendment within parentheses inadvertantly not read into record.)

All passed the House, May 20th, 1995.

And another Message on Senate Bill 1066 with House Amendment 1.

Passed the House, May 21st, 1995.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, on page 9 of today's Calendar is the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. Mr. Secretary, will you proceed. Page 9. First bill is House Bill 32. Take it out of the record. House Bill 820. Senator Maitland. Out of the record. House Bill 865. Senator O'Malley. Out of the record. Senate <sic> Bill 1089. Senator Mahar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1108 -- I mean, House Bill 1108. Senator Raica. Out of the record. House Bill 1437. Senator Petka. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1437.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are there any...

SECRETARY HARRY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Petka.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 represents a compromise that was reached with some of the opponents initially of Senate Amendment No. 1. It cleans up the language and -- and meets the concerns that were raised, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, vote Aye -- say Aye. All opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1473. Senator Weaver. Out of the record. House Bill 1474. Senator Weaver. Out of the record. House Bill 1654. Senator Petka. Out of the record. House Bill 2108. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. House Bill 2251. Senator DeAngelis. Out of the record. House Bill 2294. Senator Mahar. Out of the record. With leave of the Body, can we go back to 1108 for Senator Raica? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Raica, 1108? Mr. Secretary, will you read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1108.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Madam President, can I have leave to have Senator Viverito handle Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1108?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any objection? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

May I say, Senator Raica, No. 2 is my amendment. Amendment No. 2?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Madam President, Amendment No. 1 is audits to the MWRD, and I just move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

...(microphone cutoff)...for a moment, because we have some problems with the power. Mr. Secretary, is the power in order now?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Madam President, on House Bill 1108, Amendment No. 1 was held in committee. Floor Amendment No. 2 is offered by Senators Viverito and Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Viverito, Senate Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, Madam Chairman. This amendment to House Bill 1108, the Amendment No. 2 -- Amendment -- 1108 on page -- by replacing line 1 and 2 with the following.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

This is the opportunity to change the Water Reclamation District into elected nine-member board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All those in favor of Amendment No. 2, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, in the opinion of the Chair. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments for -- that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill... On page 12, there is Senate Bill 428, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence of Senate Bills. The intent of the Chair is to proceed to this order for the purpose of non-concurring motions. Senator Dunn. Mr. Secretary, will you read Senate Bill 428.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 428 with House Amendment 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. I move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn moves to non-concur with House Amendment No. 3. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, say Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. On page 5 of today's Calendar is the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. We're going to proceed to the Order of 3rd Reading on page 5, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. And could we ask you for a little order. Now that you've been away for two days, please give us your utmost attention. Thank you. Page 5. House Bill 36. Senator Dillard.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 36.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate. I'll start us off tonight on 3rd Reading. This bill does two things. First, it amends the Juvenile Court Act to encourage discretionary transfer to adult court of minors who are charged with the delivery of greater than ten grams of cannabis, or within a thousand feet of school grounds. Courts can do this today, but we feel that we need this change in the law to basically encourage the court, when it's near a school, or when it's a large amount of marijuana, to try them as adults. The second thing that this bill does is that we added a cleaned-up version of House Bill 115, that allows law enforcement agencies that have a reciprocal agreement with a school in their jurisdiction, as authorized under the School Code, to provide the school with arrest information on minors from that school, and that better coordinates juvenile delinguency activity between the school officials, as well -- and their local law enforcement officials. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 36 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 41. Senator Mahar. House Bill 90. Senator Karpiel. Out of the record. House Bill 150. Senator Klemm. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 150.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 150 allows for incorporation of a small municipality located in Kane County, and Amendment No. 1 is a provision for Lake County that would prohibit municipalities in Lake County from annexing noncontiguous territories separated by a forest preserve district. That's all it does, and I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Just a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He yield -- he indicates he will yield.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Is this the bill that deals with Prestbury in -- outside of Aurora?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SENATOR LAUZEN:

May I just ask what the Senator's position, who represents that area, is on this bill? Does he request passage or rejection of the measure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Senator Rauschenberger, who I spoke to, is not too enthusiastic about this. Everybody else seems to be neutral. He knows -- wants us to proceed with it, but he did want on record, to show that he's not enthusiastic.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussions? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, way it appears to me here, what we're going to be starting, and we're going to set a precedent on, is to allow one unit of government to leapfrog over another unit of government, to continue their unit of government. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

I'm not sure I understood your question. I was distracted here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Would you clarify your question, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, let me restate it, and -- and see if I understand what

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

you're telling me correctly. You're stating that what we are going to do is to allow a municipality to leapfrog over a park district. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

No, it'd just be the opposite.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you. I -- I misunderstood the Senator, and I thank you for that clarification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SENATOR KLEMM:

No. I think I answered all the questions, and I was asked some questions here privately that I was trying to answer. I think everybody's satisfied. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 150 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those who vote -- opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Had all voted who wished? Had all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 51 voting Yea, 1 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 206. Senator Cronin. Take it out of the record. House Bill 207. Senator O'Malley. Out of the record. House Bill 226. Senator O'Malley. Out of the record. House Bill 238. Senator Lauzen. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. House Bill 238.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill -- House Bill 238.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

What House Bill 238 does is, it eliminates having a tax on a tax on utility bills. Under the current law, municipalities that impose a municipal utility tax include the amount of the State utility tax, in their tax base. What this does is, it phases in, over a three-year period of time, where there cannot be a tax on a tax. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Lauzen, to close.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I just request an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

On that question -- the question is, shall House Bill 238 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, none voting No, 1 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 301. Senator Walsh -- I mean, Senator Petka. I'm sorry. 301, Senator Petka? Out of the record. House Bill 320. Senator Cullerton. Senator Cullerton, 320? Out of the record. House Bill 330. Senator Watson. Out of the record. House Bill 340. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read House Bill 340.

SECRETARY HARRY:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

House Bill 340.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill amends the Township Code to do two things. First, it permits the coverage of retired officials and their dependents under a township group insurance plan. But I want to make it very clear that the burden of this payment falls upon the retiree, and it is very clear in the bill that no tax money shall be used, in any fashion, to fund this type of insurance coverage. The second thing the bill does is, it allows a township treasurer to - when they publish the annual report of the township - to go with a bracketing system for the publishing of employees' salaries, like other units of local government and school districts. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Dillard, to close.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 340 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 377. Senator Parker. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 377.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bank is a -- is -- includes numerous sections of the Banking Act that have been revised. It has been requested by the IBA, the Corporate Fiduciaries, the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts. It also incorporates several bills that passed here unanimously. And I would ask for your favorable approval, and answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

She indicates she will yield, ma'am.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Parker, I -- could you just be a little more specific about this bill? My analysis has to be forty pages long, what with all the additions. If you could just explain the bill a little more in depth. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you. My analysis is as long as that also. It actually revises various Acts affecting regulated financial institutions, which have been suggested by the Illinois Bankers Association,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Commissioner of Banks and Trusts. And it -- okay -- authorizes a bank to exchange -- no we won't go into that. Okay. It makes a sort οf housekeeping amendment. It's requested by the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts. It repeals requirements that bank directors own specified interest in their bank, and that they take an oath of fealty to the bank. It revises voluntary bank dissolution procedures, and provides for expedited dissolution of a bank, and surrender of its charter where the bank has already transferred substantially all of its assets and liabilities. banks internal State and federal regulatory the compliance review documents from use in civil proceedings. that okay? Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Parker, to close.

SENATOR PARKER:

I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 377 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that bill, there are 54 voting Aye, none voting No, 2 voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 385. Senator Maitland. No. Out of the record. House Bill 505. Senator Maitland. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 505.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Madam President. House Bill 505, as amended, does actually three things: It provides that in addition to any other person authorized by law, a sheriff may administer the oath of office to a deputy sheriff; it also has in it an amendment that was requested by DuPage County, to allow a referendum question on juvenile detention facilities to combine the two questions of construction and taxation for -- for such -- for such facilities; and it also -- the tax rate, however -- and this is combined by this language to six cents of EAV of all property in the county. Now the tax levy is four for construction and two for EAV. This tax rate shall be reduced by two percent the year following the repayment to construction contractors. This, again, was an amendment that was suggested by DuPage County. I know of no opposition and seek your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On that guestion, the record, Mr. Secretary. There are 55 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 527. Senator DeAngelis. Out of the record. House Bill Senator Mahar. House Bill 652. Senator Parker. Senator Parker? Out of the record. House Bill 838. Senator Cronin. Out of House Bill 929. Senator Karpiel. Senator Collins, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am? Your light is on, Senator Karpiel? Mr. Secretary, will you read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

House Bill 929.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. As it stands, House Bill 929 is somewhat of a home for two -- two bills, one of which is the exemption for a -- a transfer station in Crestwood, which was built and operating before the -- the setback -- the legislation that provided for setbacks on transfer stations was passed. So this is an exemption for them, so they can continue operating. And the other one is -- amends the Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. Provides that appropriations to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency for activities association -- associated with preparing and implementing plans to deal with the effects of nuclear accidents shall not exceed six hundred and twenty-five thousand in FY'96, seven hundred and twenty-five thousand in FY'97, and seven hundred and seventy-five thousand in FY'98 and thereafter. I'd ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Karpiel, to close. On that question -- on that question, shall House Bill 929 pass, those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On that question, there are 54 -- 56 voting Aye, none voting No. 1 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House -- we a little problem with our power. House Bill 955. Senator Karpiel. Mr. Secretary, will you -- Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Madam President, may I have leave to come back to this later? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Hearing no objection, you have leave. 965. Senator Woodyard. Senator Woodyard? Thank you. Out of the record. 974. Senator Klemm. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 974.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 974 -- the underlying bill authorizes the forest preserve district in a county with less than four hundred and one population -- four hundred thousand and one population to sell little parcels of less than one acre by unanimous vote of the board. Those appraisal values and the sale must be used for future land acquisition. Also requires the appointment of officers and employees by downstate forest preserve districts to be made by the president with the advise and consent of the board. in cases in which the corporate authority of a county, or municipality, or sanitary district, also serves as the forest preserve district commissioners. It provides that whenever a property that is located within a park district also lies within a municipality that has established a recreation board, the property that is being taxed by both entities, the voters could petition to disconnects <sic>. There's a series of amendments that were there. One is allowing Kane County Forest Preserve District to sell small parcels, which I described to you earlier. We also have provisions that will allow the forest preserve district

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

downstate to have long-term leases for any entity that operates a county fair. Amendment No. 2 also require that forest preserve districts issue a license for the use of property that must be directly related to the purposes for which the forest preserve district was created. And it does require two-thirds vote for the security of that provision. Amendment No. 3 amends the downstate forest preserve district to permit leasing or operation concessions in their property. It grandfathers the existing provisions that have been allowed before, but it says that they can't do it any further. Amendment No. 4 allows park districts to enforce its ordinances upon property which it owns but is with not -- not within the borders of the district. It also it allows park districts' annexations to be filed in the county offices in which the annexation takes place. And the amendment to it allows the county board -- no, let's see what it does -- hold on a minute. Allows a local township board trustees to appoint fire protection districts in Cook County where the fire prevention <sic> district lies wholly within that single county, but contains one or more municipalities. And I -me -- and I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President. I just want for the -the Members here -- excuse me -- for the Members here in the
Chamber. Though, basically, this bill is pretty nebulous, on the
whole, Amendment No. 6 is a shameless power grab at the County of
Cook, in which it takes away some of the power that the present
Chairman, John Stroger, has. Though, it does not impact directly,
downstate, nor does it impact on the collar counties. What
happens is, this is a precedent, and what we do today can
certainly be -- probably be done tomorrow in your district. And I

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

ask all Members to vote No, and if it should pass, ask for verification of the roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you, Senator Trotter. Further discussion? Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. it's -- the one thing that I'm concerned with, evidently, is Amendment 6. It seems -- and I apologize, Senator Parker, that I'm not sure that that was attached on 2nd Reading, or where it was, but I've been told, the fire districts in Illinois opposed to Amendment 6. And it seems that you're taking the control from a county board to a township board, is that correct? It deals with the appointment of the fire district trustees. And although our analysis says, "This applies only to Cook County", I'm not so sure that it -- that it does. And in downstate Illinois, we have elective -- or -- or, fire district trustees, as well as appointed. And, traditionally, that authorization on appointment has been within the purview of the county board. And I guess, what I'm saying, does that -- does that change what we're doing with downstate fire district trustees?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard? Further discussion? Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to clarify, we had this discussion on Friday. This does not affect any other county but Cook. This is only for about eight or ten townships. This is not any power grab. This seems to make sense. We have not been

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

able to correct this before; where, actually, in a township where the township fire district is located within one township, the local township people support and they are the ones that appoint the fire district people on the board, but if you have a district that may have even five percent of some other township. all of a sudden that appointment power is taken down to the Cook County Board President. It just doesn't make sense. We should leave it at that local level. And that's all we're trying to do. These are unpaid. They are, you know, not patronage workers. They are just local. So I wanted to clarify that it has with downstate. It is only for Cook County and it only affects eight to ten townships. And it's because Cook County is different, because we have so many townships in it. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I just rise to point out for those Members who don't live in Cook County, as I do, that Cook County's population is about 5.3 million people. Nearly half the State of Illinois live in Cook County. The house I live in is more than an hour's drive from the Cook County Building at sixty-five miles an hour. It's a very, very large county. Granting this discretion to townships to -- to appoint fire district trustees makes sense where I live, and that's why this legislation is written for Cook County only. It's very difficult for a -- for a board sitting in downtown Chicago to understand the needs we have in the outlying parts of the suburbs. So, I would request a favorable roll call and support this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Viverito. SENATOR VIVERITO:

One for clarification, Madam President.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Point of clarification,

SENATOR VIVERITO:

In -- in the event there our areas - and maybe I didn't make myself quite clear, the last time - that have an elected fire district in a township, what are you going to do in that case?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

It doesn't affect elected. It wouldn't...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Klemm, would you...

SENATOR KLEMM:

It would not affect those positions and it would continue the way it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: While I support the bill as written, I still have a problem with Amendment No. 6, and because of that I'll -- I'll have to vote No. Even though the president is making these appointments, he does not make them without input from the commissioners from your area. So those Senators who are far away from the county building, you still have a commissioner duly elected, who -- who represents you, who works with the president of the county board. And I simply could not stand here and vote for anything that would dilute the power of my great friend, John Stroger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Klemm, to close.

SENATOR KLEMM:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

No. I just ask for your support. I think we tried to cover all the points that everybody asked for, and try to maintain the integrity that we all would want. So I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 974 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the -- the record. On that question, there are 33 voting Aye, 24 voting Nay, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. I believe Senator Trotter -- are you asking for a verification? Senator -- Senator Trotter has requested a verification of House Bill 974's vote. Will all Senators be in their seat. The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Does Senator Trotter question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Cronin. I'm sorry, she's <sic> not on...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cronin - he didn't vote.

SENATOR TROTTER:

I'm sorry, I see her now. Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Barkhausen? Senator Barkhausen here? Senator

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Barkhausen here? Strike his name.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeLeo? Senator DeLeo here? Senator DeLeo? Strike his name. Any further? Any further? Senator Trotter, is that it?

SENATOR TROTTER:

No. That's -- thank you very much, Madam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

On that question, there -- on a verified roll call, the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 24, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby passed. Committee Reports, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislation Measures have been assigned to committees: referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation - motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 623; to the Committee on Education - motions to concur with House Amendments 1 and 8 to Senate Bill 50, House Amendment 4 to Senate Bill House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 365 and House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1005; to the Committee on Executive - Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 90, Amendment 1 to House Bill 320 and Amendment 1 to House Bill 2429; to the Committee on Higher Education - Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 820; to the Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - motions to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 114, Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 831 and Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1142; to the Committee on Judiciary -Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1248; to the Committee on Local Government and Election -- Elections - the motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 63, Amendment 1 to Senate Bill

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

77, Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 158, and Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 948; to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare - Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2226 and Amendment 4 to House Bill 2330; to the Committee on Revenue - Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1523; Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 41, Amendment 1 to House Bill 206, Amendment 1 to House Bill 999, Amendment 3 to House Bill 1089, Amendment 2 to House Bill 1246, Amendment 5 to House Bill 1268, Amendment 2 to House Bill 1279, Amendment 1 to House Bill 1303, Amendment 3 to House Bill 1462, Amendment 1 to House Bill 1654 and Amendment 8 to House Bill 2108; and a Sponsorship Change Approved Pursuant to Rule 5 -1(c) - House Bill 1023, Senator Fitzgerald, the new sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We'll resume 3rd Reading, and we'll start on page 6. House Bill 999. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. House Bill 1069. Senator Petka. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

House Bill 1069.

SECRETARY HARRY:

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 1069, as amended, first of all, rewrites the definition of sexual penetration. In addition to that, Senate Bill 145 was amended, which makes the statute of limitations consistent for sexual offenses committed against children, and also makes a change to the Code of Civil Procedure, to provide for a consistent statute of limitations of twelve years. It's supported by the Coalition Against Sexual Assault. I'm not aware of any opposition. And I would urge its adoption.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1069 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1116. Senator Dillard. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1116.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill comes to us as an agreement between title companies and mechanical contractors, and it provides that -- or permits a court to order payment of reasonable attorney's fees from an owner or a lien claimant who fails to pay a lien claimant or owner without just cause or right. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition and this is a worked-out bill between the mechanical contractors and the title companies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1116 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, none voting No, 3 voting

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1202. Senator Woodyard. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. 1202.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1202.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. really sorry that Gary LaPaille is no longer with us the Senate, because he normally commented on my jackets. And so if somebody over there wants to do that, fine. Really, House Bill 1202, as you well know, is -- is a -- a bill dealing with trucks. and it delineates the -- the measurements between the kingpin the rear axle of these trucks. There's no extension of the -- of the overall length of the semitrailer, but it would allow that measurement, either from the front axle or from the kingpin to the front axle, to be extended by three feet. Now, there has been a -- a -- a plethora of -- of people who seem to indicate that this is somehow indicating or -- or, increasing in a hazard of safety. Well, the State Police don't seem to feel that way, nor do the Department of Transportation, who are both neutral on that. is a very strong opponent group against this bill, the DuPage County Mayors Association. I will tell you that the -- the DuPage Highway Commissioner has no problem with this bill, does not feel that it would impact on -- on safety of -- of the roads. than that, I don't know of any other opposition to this. kind of put us in -- in compliance or context with what law is doing and most all of our sister states do allow this kind of axle-spacing. And with that, Madam President, I'd be

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

glad to answer any questions, or seek a favorable roll call.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

I just wanted to point out that I concur with Senator Woodyard. We had this at length in Transportation Committee. Really all we're talking about is relocation of the axles, which allows the weight to be distributed more evenly, and most people involved in trucking are in favor of that, and I think it's a good Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I have asked the DuPage Mayors and Managers to come up with a transportation committee, and they did. And when I asked them who was on this committee, it turned out it was a number of policemen, and a -- and an attorney. So when I called up the county highway road commissioner and asked him if, indeed - or, the county engineer - if, indeed, this, he thought, would cause any problems, he said, "Those trucks are running all over DuPage County now" and, no, he did not think it was a problem. What I plan on doing is going back and telling the DuPage Mayors and Managers maybe they ought to reconstitute their committee. And I would suggest an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Well, I stand in opposition to all my good friends, who are supporting this, and the trucking industry. I have a question that I would like to ask the sponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SENATOR KARPIEL:

And it was something that Senator Fawell said also. Are these trucks now on the highway? I see these trucks on the highway. What is this bill doing differently then? You know, what's the difference between this bill and allowing them now on our highways, because obviously they are there?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Oops. Senator Karpiel, I guess I'm going to ask you, are these trucks on the highway? You're darn right they are. They've got sliding rear axles on most of those semitrailers. Is the law being enforced? No, it's not, because when -- when those trucks come out of Missouri, Iowa, Kentucky, Indiana, on the weight distribution, you normally find that longer axle spread. So it's there now. And, I guess what I'm trying to do is codify what other states are doing; what is presently being done today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Donahue. Senator Donahue. Oh. I'm sorry. Would you respond. That isn't coming from here - all that noise - but it's coming. Go ahead, Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

It announces that you're coming. Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Woodyard, then this bill is -- doesn't do anything. I mean, right now, they are not really supposed to be on our highways. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, will this -- will this legislation allow them on any other roads, other than the -- the highways and tollways? Would this allow them on the small county roads, or are they already there, too?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator, no, it will not allow them on all highways. There -there is a five-mile access, but -- but, by and large, those are
to terminals, and things like that and it would not allow them on
county roads or township roads at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, I just -- I would like to just say, I'm not standing here at the request of the DuPage Mayors and Managers, but my own concerns. Last year we passed a bill which would allow these trucks, these huge, longer trucks, heavier trucks, on -- five miles off of the highway - was that it? - something like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

And everyone told us -- I mean, I was told that that was not going to infringe upon the municipalities. They could -- they could post a sign, saying they weren't allowed and that type of thing. I went home and I got a lot of heat from my municipalities that now have these huge trucks driving down their municipal streets, breaking them up pretty good. The problem with this

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

bill, these kinds of trucks, is not the length, and they are correct. It is not going to make the length longer. What it does is increasing -- it increases the turning radius of the trucks. And I don't know about you quys, but I've almost gotten -- you know, bashed my car in, when I'm waiting at a red light and one of these comes the other way and makes a turn, because it takes them two lanes to turn. And if it's only a two-lane road and you're waiting there in the one lane, I got to tell you that these trucks don't belong on some of these roads. I've asked the Department of Transportation for a impact note, and they say there are approximately two hundred intersections in the State that have geometrics which are inadequate for longer dimension vehicles for these vehicles. And it would cost approximately fifty thousand dollars per intersection to improve, which equates to ten million dollars estimated system impact. I would urge a No vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This — this legislation doesn't change any weight limit at all. All this does is, helps comply with the federal bridge law that was passed some years ago. When they — when they passed the federal bridge law and allowed trucks to haul eighty thousand pounds, in this State, they raised the license fee from eighteen hundred dollars to twenty—two hundred dollars. All they do with this is — is they can stretch out there truck just a little bit. And if you drive down the highway, anytime you're passing a truck, just take a look under that truck and you'll see the rear axle. They have about a six-foot perforated hose, where they can shift those axles back and forth, and it lets them — that way they can get into compliance with the weight, you can only carry so much weight on each set of these axles. It doesn't change anything — any weight

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

limit at all; it just lets them -- it makes it easier for them to get into compliance and -- with the federal bridge law. And if any driver isn't capable of making a turn, then he doesn't need to have the CDL license. There's no problem at all with -- with this legislation; it -- it just helps them get into compliance a little better.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator Walsh. Further discussion?

SENATOR WALSH:

Yeah. Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I, too, stand in opposition. I -- I'd like to ask a question, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WALSH:

Senator, can -- can you tell me, what -- what highways these trucks would -- would be able to drive on that they may not drive on now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes, Senator. This would authorize - which they're doing today - the Class IIs, and certainly -- I believe the Class Is - which already - that's the interstates - which already have -- have this kind of compliance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

But it's not limited to the interstates, they'd be able to drive on like Route 45, Mannheim Road, Cicero Avenue, Irving Park Road, North Avenue, all of -- in these urban areas?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

They would be able to drive on two-lane State routes, as well as the interstates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Well, I just -- I stand in opposition, and I think that anybody who lives in an urban area who has heard from their constituents that have complained about truck traffic, should beware of this bill, because this is what they're against. They're -- this is going to add to the traffic on the -- on the highways, in the urban areas, particularly the Mannheim Roads, the North Avenues, the Cicero Avenues, and I don't think that -- that this is a good idea at this time. Until we can come up with something that would encourage the truck drivers to use the tollways and -- and expressways, I don't think we should be supporting this type of legislation. And I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I wasn't going to speak on this bill. I -- I will say to the Body, up front, that I have a potential conflict of interest here. But I cannot believe some of the comments that I'm hearing about a bill. This is probably the most misunderstood bill of the Session. I think Senator O'Daniel and Senator Woodyard and others have done their best to explain what the bill does. Let me say to you that I almost resent the Department of Transportation putting down a figure like that. Senator O'Daniel, you're -- you're absolutely right; these trucks, the drivers have all the talent and the ability necessary. If -- if they can't make those turns

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

with the configuration that we're talking about here, they sure as heck can't make it under the existing law. There's no way in heck they can. There's no question that there are some difficult turns to make. But stop and think what you're saying here. You're talking about truckers that are coming in off the road with merchandise that's being delivered to every community in this State. And those truckers are having it — finding it more and more difficult to make a profit anyway. And they can traverse the other roads, this length and this weight, and they have to deliver sometimes to your communities. The very people that are opposing this bill are getting commodities and goods on trucks now that are allowed to traverse these roads. This isn't going to damage anything, and the bill ought to be supported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

SENATOR WOODYARD:

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

Thank you, Madam President. And to my suburban colleagues, don't think this is going to affect you, other than the fact you may have some trucks not bringing Post Toasties and corn flakes and bread to you if this thing doesn't pass. I think Senator O'Daniel probably did a better job in closing than what I What we're trying to do is be in compliance with what is known as a truck bridge formula. Has nothing whatsoever to do with bridges. But it has to do with the spread of the load over the axle spacing. And all we're trying to do is be in compliance with what other states are doing. Nobody has ever told us that this is Why on earth would the State Police and a safety hazard. Department of Transportation, if there were any safety problems why would the DuPage Highway Commissioner - not be opposed to this bill, if it were a safety hazard? It is not. And,

President, I -- I certainly solicit a favorable roll call.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

On that question -- the question is, shall House Bill 1202 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 16 voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1212. Senator Peterson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1212.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 1212, the bill itself, directs the Illinois Department of Revenue to acknowledge all taxpayer inquiries regarding income tax refunds within ten days of receipt of the inquiry, by sending a response to the taxpayer with the following information: the date the inquiry was received, file number assigned to the inquiry, and the name and the telephone number of a person within the Department of Revenue that the taxpayer may contact for further information. This bill has several amendments, and amendment was to address a one multi-assessment district problem in Bond County. The language clarifies that, only for purposes of Section 2-10 of the Property Tax Code, a township shall be considered contiquous if one corner of a township touches the corner of another township in a multi-assessment district. Another amendment contains the final agreement between the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Department of Revenue, regarding application of the manufacturer's

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

purchase credit. It has several income tax checkoffs, one for Special Olympics, one for Mental Health Research Fund. It also has a provision that clarify that if TIF districts dissolve, the entire increment shall be treated as new property. Another checkoff for the Children's Cancer Fund, sponsored by Senator Carroll. Another amendment sponsored by Senator Jones, checkoff for drug abuse prevention. Amendment by Senator Klemm, amending the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act to change the sales tax credit for the purchase of building materials that will be incorporated into a High Impact Business, to an up-front exemption. Amendment 12 clarifies Amendment 11. It's a technical provision. I ask for your affirmative vote on House Bill 1212, as amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Senator Peterson, I did have several calls, the end of last week, on two of the amendments that, one time that were proposed on this bill, from people in the tourism industry - 6 and 10. Can you tell us the statuses of Amendment No. 6 and Amendment 10?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Those amendments were tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the sponsor.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Peterson, I think you mentioned three checkoffs in this. If these are approved, how many checkoffs will we have on the income tax return for the coming year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

There are three or four on this bill. I don't know how many others are on legislation, and I don't know if they'll get to the Governor's desk. And I have no idea how many they can put on the income tax form.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, that's about three of the other questions I had, so... You said there was an agreement between the Manufacturers Association on -- on a tax and I didn't understand. What was the agreement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Let me look through my file, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson. Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

It contains the final agreement between the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Department of Revenue regarding application of the manufacturer's purchase credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SENATOR PETERSON:

It's supported by the State Chamber, IMA, Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois, Caterpillar, Department of Revenue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Do you have a fiscal note, signed by somebody from the Senate or directly signed by the Department, on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

I -- I can come up with one real quickly, Senator, if you need one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SENATOR PETERSON:

Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 1212 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 1 -- none voting Present. And this bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1246. Senator Karpiel, did you wish this bill to be returned to 2nd Reading? Senator Karpiel seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1246 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading -- on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1246.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment 2 actually takes out the entire Section dealing with the criminal trespass that was not worked out, and we were running into problems with groups having -- you know, finding other problems with it, so we're taking that entire language out and just leaving two very little noncontroversial pieces in the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All right. Any discussion? Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say Aye -- of this amendment. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes, in the opinion of the Chair, have it, and this amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'm sorry, Madam President. I just wanted to -- to make a comment earlier. I know...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is that a personal privilege?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. Point of personal privilege, if you will.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, sir.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator Woodyard got up earlier and mentioned that Gary LaPaille wasn't here to say anything about his jacket. So, in our row here, we -- we did take a vote, and the unanimous choice over here for this jacket was Spike Jones. So I just wanted to make you aware of that. Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Spike Jones, Senator Woodyard, has been referred to you. Any -- Senator Molaro, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MOLARO:

Yes. On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Somehow last Friday, I -- I thought I voted Yes on a bill. It's 1967. I'm recorded as No, but I would like the record to reflect that I would -- that somehow it was a mistake, and I intended on voting Yes on House Bill 1967. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Your intention will be noted. Senator Trotter, for what purpose do you wish to speak?

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Will the sponsor yield on this bill, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We haven't read the bill yet.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...called it. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

House Bill 1248. Senator Hawkinson. Out of the record. House Bill 1268. Did you wish this bill to be returned to the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Hawkinson? That's 1268. Is that correct? Senator Hawkinson seeks leave of the Body to return

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

House Bill 1268 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading in House Bill 1268. Madam Secretary, have there been any amendments from the Floor for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cullerton, on Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 1268.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This amendment either adds or subtracts a comma. I can't remember which. Subtracts a comma. Takes a comma out of a definition that was inadvertently put in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say Aye. All those opposed, say Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1270. Senator Butler. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1270.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1270.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 1270, as amended, establishes at -- in DASA a program

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

on compulsive gambling, in order to create an awareness of the problem. It -- it establishes a hot line number. It provides for some in-service training so the problem can be recognized. It also requires certain signs to be posted in -- in certain locations, such as racetracks, riverboats, bingo parlors, et cetera. It was amended in the House to provide that DASA may also contract with a -- either a private or a public entity on such a program. And finally, it deleted a rather unworkable provision which would have required riverboat owners to put stickers on every gaming machine on the boat. So, with that, I think we've removed the opposition. I'd appreciate your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR SHAW:

Senator Butler, who will pay for this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

DASA, at the moment, has funds. And it requires DASA to take a half a million dollars of the -- of the funds they have and devote it to this program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

I -- I just want to commend you on the -- on the bill. I
think it's a good bill, and it's a step in the right direction.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Couple of questions of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

I guess this would be called the gambling-can-be-hazardous-to-your-health bill. We're going to be posting signs now in places of -- gambling takes place. Does this include your local market and local 7-Eleven, and wherever they may buy a lottery ticket?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I presume the question concerns the lottery sales? It does. There's an eight -- eight and a half by eleven sign. One sentence -- requires it to be no longer than one sentence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

What's that one sentence?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

DASA is to establish that by rule.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. We're being criticized by the media, or others, about not establishing this "800" phone number for people who are having gambling problems. Isn't that already law, and

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

shouldn't that already be -- why are we doing it again?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I would -- I would presume, Senator, that it'd have to be included in -- in an Act on compulsive gambling. As you know, they do have one now on -- on alcoholism and substance abuse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, thank you, Madam President. A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Butler, didn't the riverboat legislation include a -a requirement that a program for compulsive gamblers be
established and didn't that also include a funding mechanism for
that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I'm sorry, Senator, I'm just not aware of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, I -- I thought that there was that requirement, and I think Senator Watson alluded to it. But I am going to vote for this bill. I just want to make sure that we don't do the same thing again, because this bill says that the program is subject to appropriation through DASA. So I'm afraid that, once again, we're going to say that we're going to establish a program for compulsive gamblers, and then fail to follow up and fail to -- to

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

fund it. So, I hope that doesn't happen again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator Butler, obviously there are compulsive gamblers. Do you have a number for us on the number of compulsive gamblers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

There are no estimates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

What are we basing the appropriation on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

There is no appropriation at the moment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Does this merely establish a program, then we're going to work out the details later?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

If -- correct, if there's funding available.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Further discussion? Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

SENATOR BOWLES:

So that it is really clear that even in church bingos, or the VFW, or any of those places where they might be playing bingo, that they would have to post a sign?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill, and for those who asked the questions about funding: Last year the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of our very able chairman, Chairman Maitland, put four hundred thousand dollars in for a compulsive gambling program, but the -- the -- the money was given to the Gaming Board, and they refused to spend it. So, this is a wonderful piece of legislation, something that I join my esteemed colleagues, Senator Butler and Senator Fawell, cosponsor on, and it is my intention to attempt to get, at least that four hundred thousand that was not spent last year, that we did appropriate to the Gaming Board, to be given to DASA, which is probably more appropriate for this type of a program. people to vote for this. There are a number of people who simply cannot stop gambling at all. And I am not against gambling; I gamble myself; but this is for people who lose the house, the home, the car, the wife, the kids, and everything to -- to

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

gambling, and we simply should give them some kind of help, and I ask you for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, a little more quiet. Senator Burzynski. Further discussion?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a comment. I would urge an Aye vote on this bill, as well. I also urge all my colleagues to be sure and remember this vote when they have future votes regarding expansion of off-track betting parlors, and other riverboats, and things like that in the State. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SENATOR BUTLER:

Just one comment. I want to correct -- I misspoke. The half a million dollars, I referred to, was in the bill that we passed last year. This bill is subject to appropriation. And I -- and I ask your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 1270 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 3 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

House Bill 1279. Senator Rauschenberger. Is he there? Senator Rauschenberger, did you wish to recall this bill to 2nd Reading? Senator Rauschenberger seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1279 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 1279. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

This amendment adds a -- an effective date to an otherwise shell bill that we've got positioned in case we need statutory change for the close of Session. I would urge its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Severns. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. I just realized it's on 2nd. I was just wondering if this could ultimately contain the prompt pay provision, but since it's on 2nd, excuse me and I'll wait till 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? All those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is hereby adopted. Any further Floor amendments for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

3rd Reading. House Bill 1303. Senator Lauzen, are you asking this bill to be -- House Bill 1303. Senator Lauzen. Would you read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1303.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. This legislation from the Chicago Bar Association amends the Property Tax Code. Does five things, among those are: It requires that appointees to a township or multi-township assessor position must be of the same political party as the person vacating the office. Number two, it provides that any money in the county treasurer's fund from certificate of purchase fees, in excess of five hundred thousand dollars, must be paid to the general fund of the county after satisfying any existing unpaid judgments entered pursuant to Section 21-295, and several other provisions. I am not aware of any opposition. Be happy to answer any questions I can.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield?

SENATOR WALSH:

Senator, does this apply to Cook County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen, the question is, whether it

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

applies to Cook County.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I believe that it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Now, the appointment -- or the filling of a vacancy, what do you do in the situation where it was a nonpartisan election?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I don't know the answer to that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Walsh. Anything further, Senator Walsh?

SENATOR WALSH:

Well, I was just curious, because in -- I know in -- in Cook County, most of the township elections are nonpartisan, I think, with the exception of maybe two or three townships. And I -- I'm -- I'm just curious because this -- this would affect -- this would affect our area. I -- I would have a couple of other problems with the local assessors too, as far as I would maybe be more willing to see an amendment to abolish the office, which is a duplicative office, because the assessor can't -- by law -- the township assessor can't, by law, assess, inasmuch as it's done by the Cook County assessor. So, maybe we could just leave the vacancy, if there is a -- should be one. I'd be more in favor of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any -- any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Lauzen, to close.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I would just ask for an Aye vote.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 1303 pass. Those in favor. vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, none voting No, and 2 voting This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1461. Senator Mahar. House Bill 1462. Senator Parker. Madam Secretary, read the bill. Are you seeking to -- leave of the Body to return this bill to 2nd Hearing no objection, leave is granted for Senator Parker to return this bill to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1462. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Parker.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Madam President. This amendment simply is a bill that we passed out of here, eventually, with no opposition. It allows counties to have the option, if they chose, of flexibility in the use of their motor fuel tax. The bill's gotten hung up in the House, and now I would like to amend it onto this bill. This passed...(microphone cutoff)...Transportation Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Parker asks that this amendment be approved. All those in favor of the approval of this amendment, in the adoption of it, signify by saying Aye. All opposed, No. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Is there any further

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

amendment approved for consideration from the Floor?
ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1465. Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley? House Bill 1465? House Bill 1470. Senator Cronin? House Bill 1523. Senator Lauzen? House Bill 1587. Senator Fawell? Senator Fawell? House Bill 1608. Senator Dillard? Out of the record, for both of those. House Bill 1730. Senator Palmer. Out of the record. House Bill 1787. Senator Walsh. Out of the record. Senate <sic> Bill 1792. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. Senate <sic> Bill 1797. Senator Rauschenberger. Read the bill. Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1797.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger, on 1797. Can we have your attention, please?

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 1797 is a result of several months of work and negotiation with employer groups, labor groups, and the Human Rights Commission. It changes provisions of the Commission's rules, so that they can be more expeditious in the way they handle hearings. Allows for immediate and direct appeal, in some cases, for members in — in the process. And basically, is an overall cleanup to help the Human Rights Commission. It passed out of the House by a vote of ninety-five to seven, and was on the Agreed Bill List in the Judiciary Commission — Committee. I would move its favorable...(machine cutoff)...

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1797 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the roll. On this case -- on this bill, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1853. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Bill 1900. Senator Philip. Out of the record. I mean. Bill. I'm sorrv. They're both House bills. House Bill 2226. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. House Bill 2330. Senator Out of the record. House Bill 2338. Senator Cronin. Parker. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2370. Senator Barkhausen. Out of the record. House Bill, I'm sorry -- House Bill 2370. House Bill Senator Rauschenberger? Out of the record. House Bill 2429. Senator Rauschenberger? Senator Rauschenberger? the record. House Bill 2465. Senator Watson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2465.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson. 2465. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

...ma'am. Yes. Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 2465 establishes the Welfare Reform Task Force. As you know, we passed the legislation earlier this Session dealing with welfare reform, and in there we had a provision that sunsets the Aid to Family with Dependent Children Program on -- on January the 1st, 1999.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

This task force will be put together and -- and asked to participate in coming up with language to replace the AFDC Program as we now know it. It's a nine-member task force. Would be appointed by the President, Speak of the House, House Minority Leader, Senate Minority Leader, six members, and then three members appointed by the Governor. One being the Director of the Department of Public Aid, or his designee, and then two from the private sector. We would ask that the task force make a -- recommendations to the General Assembly, and then we would repeal the task force on January 1st, 1999. I'd be glad to answer any questions. Otherwise, I appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, and to the -- may I ask the sponsor a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SMITH:

Last -- last week I asked you, what is it that the -- this task force can do that the committee on welfare cannot do? And if not, can -- is -- can it not be arranged that the welfare committee could perform the same duties that you are going to organize a -- a new task force? We're talking about we're hard up for money, you can't do this -- you can't this -- and -- and now you're going to organize a new task force, and you're going to put more people on payroll. What is it that -- what is it -- so intense about that particular task force? That...(machine cutoff)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

...with the -- with the welfare committee of the Senate? We -- we could reinstate the one that we had already.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, we -- we establish task forces all the time, and ask for public input. We will have two members from the private sector that would be appointed by the Governor. We will have the expertise of the Department of Public Aid's Director or -- or his The Speaker of the House will have an her designee. or opportunity to appoint a private sector member and then the -- so will the President of the Senate. Those -- having that type of individuals involved in the process and in the task force, I think is important. Obviously, the interest that would be shown by the members of the task force is also important. And the fact that they can go out, hold public hearings, ask for public input, consult with various groups that would be involved, is important. So, I just think that that being the thrust and the emphasis of the -- the task force, then we should have more public members involved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

...(microphone cutoff)...Madam Chairman, and to the -- to the sponsor. We had the same input that you're talking about right now, before. We didn't -- and we weren't charging people money and now -- and we were trying -- and we did a very effective job. Now is this supposed to be something that you're trying to give

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

added jobs to people who have done favors for the -- the State, or for the Governor? This just doesn't make sense, and you're talking about you can't let us have money to even help people, who are present or -- or assistance to people who are up against it, for five dollars an hour. And here you're going to establish a -- a -- a welfare task force. This just does not -- it's consistent, my friend. I know what you're saying. It's -- it's intelligent, but we had the same thing. What's so different? What -- what are they going to do that's -- that we have not already done in this Senate? And we were very effective. We had...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator...

SENATOR SMITH:

...sector. We had people from the providers, all on these committees, and you -- and -- and they were discontinued. Now why is this task force going to be so different?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Welfare Reform Legislation, from what we heard from the lady who's speaking now and others, was "How are you going to implement a program when you ask for the Aid to Family with Dependent Children -- when you ask that to be phased out." This is an attempt to create a responsible and a meaningful task force to come up with recommendations to do the very thing that many of you were so concerned about. I mean, that's -- was really why this was introduced. It's -- as you can see, it's the last bill on the Calendar. It's obviously something that wasn't thought about back in the early months of Session. This came about because of some of the concerns that was addressed by Members of -- that voted No in committee.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Smith, to the bill.

SENATOR SMITH:

To my colleague: I think you're trying to embarrass the people who served on the -- on the committee that we had before. We had a task force, and I think those people were competent and well able to do anything that we asked them to do. But we were discontinued, and I -- what you're saying is double-talk. This can do the same thing, and I cannot see why we would have to have -- create another task force unless you have some new people that you want to give some positions to or that the Governor has to pay back. Now this is not fair. It's not right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Smith, have you -- will you please bring your remarks to a close.

SENATOR SMITH:

I just -- I cannot see the feasibility in creating another task force, to establish a welfare reform task force - just a new name - welfare reform. We already had one, and it was working and very active. And this is just something new to add some more new names to give some more people jobs of which you already had people who you were not paying, merely that little expense to come down here, and they were well-qualified people. Now, if you're talking about saving some money, you're -- you're wasting money. And I think that -- I'm saying to all of my colleagues here, I'm asking you, please do not vote for this legislation, because it's nothing but double...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate.

Senator Watson, I -- I don't disagree with what you are doing

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

here, but you've been around here long enough to know, as I have, that you can create a task force without legislation. Really this is unnecessary. It just -- you know, the -- as a matter of fact, four of the nine members come from the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. Three come from the Governor. There's seven of the nine. Two goes to the Minority. You don't need legislation to create a task force. And once you get it created, you got all the members anyway. So what difference does it make? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further -- did you wish a response from Senator Watson? He wishes a response from you, Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I look at the makeup of the committee. There's two, four, six, seven Republicans on the Committee, and four Democrats. I mean if -- I wasn't looking for this to be a partisan issue. It -- it shouldn't be. I mean, we are trying to -- I think, sincerely address the concerns that many people brought to this Floor when we talked about sunsetting the AFDC Program and how we will go about getting input to make sure that the program or a responsible program is in its place. That's what this is about, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Again, I'm not quarreling with what you are doing, but there are not eleven members of your committee, there are nine. Seven of them are from the Majority party. Four come -- two from the President, two from the Speaker - that's four. Three from the Governor - that is seven. There are only nine, the way I read it, which means it's seven to two. That's all I'm saying. It's not eleven. It's seven to two.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Any further discussion? Senator Raica. SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We had, at the State of Illinois Center, and a few meetings down here. In fact, they were -- one of them was in Collins' office. We had like five meetings at the State of Illinois Center, regarding the question of welfare and bills to Senate Bill 10, and the entire topic of welfare reform in the State of Illinois. One of the things that came up, if I'm not mistaken. was even a recommendation that there would be committee that would be set up to take a look at welfare and -and the restructure of the welfare system in the State of Because the concern from a majority of the people that this meeting was that the Legislature, were at when the termination of welfare comes about, need not meet to discuss anything, and thereby not allowing public input as far as what the fate of welfare would be. And, if I'm not mistaken, President, they suggested, if not, there was a bill that floated in this Body regarding setting up a task force. Ι don't think Senator Watson's attempting to do is -- is -- is wrong at I think it's ensuring that when welfare sunsets that we need all. to revisit that prior to that happening and take a look at what we need to do with the possibility of restructuring Senate Bill and getting more money, hopefully, to a lot of the constituents throughout the State of Illinois. So I -- I stand in support, Chairman of Public Health, with Senator Watson on this bill. It just seems that whenever that topic is brought up in this that all of a sudden something underhanded is attempting to be Senator Watson's attempting to put it on the table and say need to take a look at this. And I would just solicit an Aye vote, at least from the Members on this side of the aisle hopefully most on the other side of the aisle.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator Watson, did Senate Bill 10 call for the creation of a task force to look at alternatives to the welfare system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, it did not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

So this task force was not a part of the -- Senate Bill that the Governor has signed already? I thought -- I thought that this -- that there was a calling for some kind of task force in Senate Bill 10? Okay. Well, the problem here is, Senator, it's not the people are opposed to the task force, and I -- I would suggest to you, you still have some time to take this bill out the record. And it's about the makeup of the task force. I -- I concur that there most certainly need to be something -- some kind of mechanism by which would allow for maximum community input involvement of the various groups and department who provides services to AFDC clients to -- to sit around the table and work out a -- a viable alternative to the welfare system, once it's sunset in Senate Bill 10. You can't do that -- you can't do that, Senator Watson, with this kind of structure. You have to have a structure that is representative of those who are involved service delivery, as well as clients. And that's all the problem is, and I would be very happy to help you, if you take it out of the record, restructure the task force and then come back before we adjourn and pass it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Watson, to close.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you, Madam President, I -- this should be, I quess, kind of an innocuous piece οf legislation, unfortunately it has created considerable discussion, such as what went on with -- with Senate Bill 10, and -- and the welfare reform. And if you'll remember the discussion and the debate that went on, those who opposed the measure that -- that included the sunsetting of the AFDC Program on January 1st. 1999. I don't know how many times I asked -- answered the question of: What are we going to do to make sure that something will be in place, in a proper manner, at that particular point in time? We're just simply not going to throw the program out, without adequate -- and -- discussion. I mean, that -- that dialogue went on here on several different times during that debate. I mean, I don't know how many times I answered the question. So, we come up with what we think is a reasonable response. We want to have public input. I don't want to throw the program out without making sure that a -- that an honest attempt, and a sincere attempt, and an attempt we're trying to get public input, and the people that are professionals in the -- in the system and recommendations That is important. I agree. I agree with the debate that went on at that time. So we come forth with legislation such as this, to make that -- respond to those concerns. That's all this is, Madam President, and I think that we should support this, hopefully send it to the Governor for his consideration. Now those that may be concerned about the -- the political makeup of this. all they need to do is go to the Governor's Office and if track record means anything, or precedent means anything, we probably will be out numbered on this task force. So that should solve the concerns of the other side of the aisle on the partisan aspects of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

this. So I would encourage a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 2465 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 34 voting Aye, 10 voting Nay, 11 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

If you turn your Calendars to page 5, with leave of the Body, we'll return to House Bill 206. Senator Cronin. Senator Cronin, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Cronin, seek leave of the Body to return House Bill 206 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 206. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment is technical in nature. Advances the bill, as we come to a close here. We will come to a close on this issue. We ask for your favorable consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.

Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bill -- House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 206. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 206.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This, as I explained, is technical in nature. We are advancing this issue. We have debated, discussed in and out of the public arena. We have some very meritorious proposals that will be considered very soon and debated very thoroughly. We ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 206 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Ayes, 10 Nays, 6 voting Present, and House Bill 206, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. If you turn your Calendars to page 10, to the middle of page 10, Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bills. Senate Bill 43. Mr. Secretary -- Senator Woodyard. Senate Bill 43. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 43.

Filed by Senator Woodyard.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill, as left the -- the House - I am sorry - as it left the Senate, dealt only with honeybees, of all things. Well, it's come back to us with a series of House amendments that deals with eggs, with Adopt-a-River, with the Feeder Swine Dealer Licensing Act, and a few other odds and ends. None of this is controversial. I probably the only concern that at least has been expressed on my side of the aisle, and this is probably one of the first that you're going to see like this: Many of these provisions put forth and -- and amended onto our Senate bill were bills that never came out of the House. Here again, I -- I don't know of any opposition to -- to the actual content of these provisions, and they're basically administrative clean-up things within Department of Agriculture. And I'll try to answer any questions I can, but I will move for concurrence on the House amendments to Senate Bill 43.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 43. 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 the Senate does concur in House -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 43. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 86. Senator Fawell. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 86.

Filed by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Basically, what the House did was strip the bill that was on that -- on Senate Bill 86 originally, and put it another place. House Amendment No. 1 becomes the bill. It was a bill that we passed originally 56 to nothing. And all it does is establishes a Domestic Relations Legal Funding Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 86. 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, and none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 86, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 105. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 105.

Filed by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This was a bill that originally passed the -- the House -- passed the Senate, and the amendments really were clean-up languages. States that a tax buyer may only buy the second year's delinquent taxes after the second installment becomes delinquent, and also, establishes a -- a date that the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

bill becomes effective.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, could you give us the -- the bill number of the Senate bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

The -- it was Senate Bill 105. It was suggested by the county treasurer's office, and what it does is, under current law a tax buyer may buy the subsequent year's taxes when they become delinquent, and this just cleans it up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 105. Those in favor will vote Aye, opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58, no Nays, none voting Present, and the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 105. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 104. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 122. Senator Klemm. Senator Klemm? Senate Bill 162. Senator Klemm. Senator Klemm? Senate Bill 176. Senator Cullerton. Senator Cullerton? Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 176.

Filed by Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1 retains the Bill 176, as we passed it unanimously out of the Senate, and it adds Senate Bill 975, which is Senator Barkhausen's bill, which also passed unanimously, 56 to nothing. And it -- the -- yes, it requires the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to take into consideration the diverse costs of doing business among different geographic regions of the State, in determining reimbursement rates. And it requires the Department to establish rates which reflect the differences. That was Senator Barkhausen's bill, which we are now passing again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Cullerton, the bill says that we're going to give different reimbursements to different areas. Could you tell me which areas have higher costs in the State, for these services, than other areas? And which would be getting more money, and which would be getting less?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

I believe that the -- the language of the bill says that they should take it into consideration. So I don't think it's a -- a -- exactly a formula change. It's a -- the actual language of the bill says that, when determining rates, the Department shall take into consideration differences in the costs of doing business among various geographical regions, and shall set rates that reflect those differences. So, don't think it's a change in the formula.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I'm sure that the sponsor of the bill had some idea what the result of having a differential in rates would be. So I would assume that since the sponsor is from your district, that your district would probably end up with more funding than -- than some other districts. Would that be a safe assumption?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No. The -- the sponsor of -- you're talking about the sponsor of the amendment, in the House? Is that what you're referring to? Sponsor of the amendment in the House was my State Representative, but it was a bill that was sponsored by Senator Barkhausen and Hughes. So, I don't know if -- if one was trying to get more money for their district by -- by introducing the amendment. I think it -- what they're just saying is it makes sense for the Department to take into consideration differences in the cost of doing business in various geographical regions. For example, things are a lot less expensive in Beardstown than they would be in Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Welch.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, that's what I'm getting at. I'm wondering what the basis is for determining what is more expensive and what is less? You know, this is like the school aid formula. All of us have our own opinion as to what the fairest formula would be, and coincidently, it just happens that our districts end up with the most money. You know, so anytime we see a formula proposal, it seems to me that the sponsors of the bill are -- are looking at it tilting in their favor. So -- so that would seem to me to be logical and -- and since you're from -- you and the sponsor of the House amendment are from one area of the State, and I'm from a different one, I'm just trying to get at, is it more favorable to you than to me?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, I -- I didn't think that you would care whether it was more favorable; I thought you would care if it was just more fair. And Senator Barkhausen and I come from very poor sections of the State, Senator Barkhausen from the Lake Forest area and mine from the Gold Coast area on the Lake -- Lake Shore Drive. And so, in -- in determining rates for paying for mental health, if we have real, real expensive doctors that live in Lake Forest and in Chicago in those high-rises, we want to give them more money, and that's what this amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I congratulate you and the House sponsor on protecting your own districts. I think that you've done an excellent job. Unfortunately, it doesn't help my district much. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Any further discussion? Senator Fawell. SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I -- I think I might be able to shed a little light on the subject. For about a year and a half, Senator Topinka, who was former president -- or, the former Chairman of the Health Committee, and another group of -- of providers, and so on and so forth, along with several members of the Health Committee met, rather continuously, and came up with this formula. I think it was generally accepted by all the providers in the State, and I think that's basically what this is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Cullerton, to close. SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. I would ask for a favorable vote. Remember that we've already voted for both the underlying bill and this amendment, and both of them passed 56 to nothing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 176. 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 55 Ayes, 3 Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 176, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the top of page 12, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bills, Senate Bill 225. Senator Madigan. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 225.

Filed by Senator Madigan.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 225, as it left the Senate, amended numerous codes in the Statutes, as requested by the Department of Professional Regulation. Mostly -- or almost all of them are -- or. them are administrative changes. The House added two amendments to Senate Bill 225. House Amendment 1 amended the Environmental Health Practitioner Licensing Act to require any person who engages in an environmental health practice after December 31st of 1996, to -- to be licensed. And it amended the Professional Engineer <sic> Act to maintain the Department's membership in the Council of Examiners, and it also would allow the Department of Professional Regulation to endorse an applicant from a foreign country if that country was a member of the North American Free Trade Agreement. I'd be glad to answer any questions on House Amendments No. 1 and 2, and otherwise would ask for concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 225. 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 225, and the -- and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 256. Senator Butler. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 256.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Filed by Senator Butler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Amendment No. 1 is a compromise worked out with the Retail Merchants regarding the -- the ability of the liquor commissioners to charge attorney's fees. That has been deleted. House Amendment No. 4 is a compromise between the non-home rule municipal association, and the associated fire -- I'm sorry, not -- I'm sorry, check that. It is a compromise between Municipal Associations and the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. And it covers the -- the use of the -- of insure fire -- foreign fire insurance revenues, and requires certain funds to be audited, and -- and also covers the way they are going to be used. So I'd ask your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion?

SENATOR BUTLER:

This -- and this covers non-home rule communities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 256. Those in favor will vote Aye. The 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 256. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 327. Senator Dunn. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 327.

Filed by Senator Ralph Dunn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 327 amends and adds to the original bill. Defines coal combustion waste and coal combustion by-product. It also allows coal combustion by-products to be used in manufacturing building material, and on IDOT road construction if substitute for lime, and other things as a structural field in mine reclamation. And this is -- I move to concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 327. 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 327, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 365. Senator Sieben. Mr. Secretary -- Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 365. Non-concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Sieben, moves to non-concur in House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 365. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

370. Senator Woodyard. Mr. Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their $Amendment\ No.\ 1$ to $Senate\ Bill\ 370.$

Filed by Senator Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The underlying bill here was proposed by the Downstate Tax Buyers Association. There was no objection to that underlying bill dealing with sales and errors. Senator DeAngelis had introduced and passed, 56 to nothing, here in the Senate, a bill -- Senate Bill 396. That resided in the House Rules Committee and was eventually amended onto this. And all it does is clarify the -- the time of deposit, by postmark, on redemption of -- of tax sales. That's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 370. 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 370, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 395. Senator Fawell. Mr. Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 395.

Filed by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. The original underlying bill was basically a clean-up bill that was requested by the Secretary of State. House Amendment No. 1 includes child abandonment and endangering the life or health of a child in the list of offenses an applicant for a school bus driver permit shall not have been convicted of committing or attempting to commit. And House Amendment 2 was really Senate Bill 1026, which passed 56 to nothing. Just requires the Secretary of State to prohibit the renewal, issuance, or reinstatement of a person's driving privilege for failure to pay certain penalties. This was a clean-up language that the clerk of the courts wanted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 395. 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 395, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Viverito, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Point of personal -- excuse me, point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

I don't know exactly how to present this question. I know that the Senate is controlled by the Republican Party, and I know that the -- all the Chairs are -- the majorities are all

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

controlled by the Republican Party, and me being a new Senator, I went to park in my parking place, and I noticed that Senator Parker had taken my place. Do I have to park across the street, or do I find another parking place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senate Bill 440. Senator Tom Walsh. Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Just on a point of personal privilege. Senator Viverito, I do not believe it's a Republican or Democratic issue; I believe it's an Italian issue. Senator Maitland took my parking space today. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their $\mbox{Amendment No. 1}$ to Senate Bill 440.

Filed by Senator Walsh.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just real quickly. Senator Viverito, you -- in your looking for a parking space, you took my parking space, and let me tell you how I handled it. I took your rearview mirror off. I just -- you'll probably never do it again. Thank you, Mr. President. House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 440 is Senate Bill 304, which passed here with I don't believe any No votes, and I'd ask to concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 440. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 440, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees; referred to the Committee on Environment and Energy - motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 629; to the Committee on Judiciary - Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 652; to the Committee on Local Government and Elections - motion to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1111; to the Committee on Revenue - Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1465; and to the Committee on Transportation - Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1587.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

I want to make you an offer you can't refuse. We want to call for an Italian caucus.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The bottom of page 12, Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bills. Senator Woodyard, on Senate Bill 442. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 442.

Filed by Senator Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. As I think you may recall, this bill dealt with suspension or revocation of licensure under Department of Professional Regulation on delinquent or defaulted student loans, and the House amendment simply clarifies that there is a process to allow for repayment of those loans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House -- shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 442. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the top of page 13, on the Order Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bills, Senate Bill 448. Senator Woodyard. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

...move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 448.

Filed by Senator Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 448 passed out of here unanimously. It's a start-up of a -- of a remediation program on chemical fertilizer plants. Another bill that dealt with, also, herbicides, pesticides -- Senate Bill 392 - never got out of House Rules Committee. It's pretty noncontroversial. It's something we've been doing for

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

quite a number of years and this simply codifies that to allow the field application of -- of wash water on herbicides, pesticides on fields.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 448. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 448, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 452. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 452.

Filed by Senator Donahue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 452. The underlying bill deals with mammography and allowing the Department of Nuclear Safety to be the accrediting agent. And the amendment simply deletes the provision for them to be able to fine various entities that don't pay their registration on time. It costs them about forty thousand dollars to do this, and they only collect about fifteen thousand dollars in fines. And so it makes sense to me, and I would move to concur in House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 452. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does -- does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 452. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 461. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 461.

Filed by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill -- the amendment to -- amendments to -- to Senate Bill -- the House amendments to Senate Bill 461 - there's two <sic> of them - they do two things. It amends the Environmental Protection Act to exempt packages or packaging components used to contain distilled spirits that have been bottled before July 1st, 1994, from the toxic packaging reduction provisions, and it also amends the Environmental Protection Act to repeal the rules regarding air emission controls -- control requirements on bakery ovens.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 461. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 461, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 534. Senator Madigan. Senator Madigan? Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 534.

Filed by Senator Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 534 added the -- dealt with the Dental Practice Act. And House Amendment No. 1 redefines or define the dental hygienist as a person who holds a license under the Act, and clarifies that dentofacial orthopedics and pediatric dentistry shall be included as branches of dentistry, and added similar language that we just passed a little while ago on 225, that require any applicant to be a U.S. citizen due to the North American Free Trade Agreement. Added some new fees. I would be glad to answer any questions on House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 534, and would ask...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 534. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. And the Senate does concur in House -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 534, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the top of page 14, Secretary's Desk, on the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Order of Concurrence, Senate Bills, Senate Bill 774. Senator Barkhausen. Senator Barkhausen? Mr. Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 774.

Filed by Senator Barkhausen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. I move for concurrence in Amendment No. 1. Most of the changes are completely technical. The one that was the subject of some discussion in the committee, and the committee did easily concur, has to do with the ability of this new Fort Sheridan Commission to, under circumstances, possibly sell land or transfer land for less than fair market value. The Fort Sheridan property, as most of you may be familiar with this unique piece of property on the shores Lake Michigan in my district, has some historic structures and it's felt that there might be a situation where competing developers could present alternative plans and one of them might offer more money but not offer a plan that was in keeping with the goals of the communities participating in this Commission, and the Commission might therefore need some flexibility, and that's what we're trying to give them here. And I therefore move concurrence. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Demuzio.
SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, the only quarrel that I would have with this piece of legislation, that it does, in fact, allow this new -- or permits this new Commission to - as Senator Barkhausen has indicated - to dispose of interest in property for less than the market value. I don't know if that is something that we do for other commissions.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

but perhaps if you could reiterate, perhaps, your argument in favor of giving the Commission that type of authority, perhaps you can convince me to vote for this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Thank you. Senator Demuzio. I was trying to do that without dragging out the discussion here unnecessarily. The Commission has -- has explained to us that they anticipate at least a mere possibility that one or more developers could present them with alternative plans. There could be a situation where one plan -- one developer offered a plan and -- and offered to more for the property than another developer that had a plan that didn't meet the -- with the goals of the commission. Which the overriding goals are, on the one hand, to preserve the historic character of the middle part of the fort property than contains many old buildings with unique architectural character, and the other overriding goal is to preserve much of the property, particularly the northern portion, for open space and recreation, since this is the only open property on the lake front property - remaining. And therefore, the commission would -might be in a situation where they would want the flexibility to accept a proposal that wasn't -- didn't necessarily involve an offer of the most money. In addition, they have, as a goal, having the golf course currently there end up in the hands of the Lake County Forest Preserve District, which is currently operating it on a lease from the Army. If there are any other questions, I'd be glad to try to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I just want to say, in

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

committee there was a lot of discussion in -- in working with the Fort Sheridan joint planning committee. They answered most of the concerns, gave us some clarifying language, and this is now a good bill. And I just ask for everyone to vote for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? 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:

Did I understand that there was an amendment put on your bill in the House?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Yes. I wouldn't be moving for concurrence unless there had been an amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Could you please -- I was tied up before. Could you please just give me a thumbnail sketch of what the amendment was?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Well, as I've been doing that, various Members have been yelling time at me, and so I -- I do so at some risk, Senator. But, apparently the clock is running. Again, it has to do with giving the developers -- or I should say the Commission some flexibility -- more flexibility than they might normally have in choosing an appropriate developer for this special piece of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

property.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 774. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present, and the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 774. And the --the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 789. Senator Karpiel. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 789.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel.

Filed by Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur in House Amendment to Senate Bill 789. As the bill left the Senate, it amended the Environmental Protection Act to clarify the definition of storage site and transfer station, and defines transfer containers. The House amendment simply tightens up the definition of transfer containers, and I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 789. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the Senate

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 789, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 866. Senator O'Malley. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 866.

Filed by Senator O'Malley.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The -the amendment to Senate Bill 866 merely adds the -- the complete
text of Senate Bill 79 that passed out of the Senate 56 to
nothing. That bill was offered by Senator Fitzgerald. It amends
the Code of Civil Procedure, the Rights of Married Persons Act,
and the Joint Tenancy Act. It clarifies that beneficial interest
in a land trust held in tenancy by the entirety shall be given the
same effect as the usual ownership of land in tenancy by the
entirety.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 866. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1095. Senator Severns. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095.

Filed by Senator Severns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This Senate bill passed out without any opposition, and I move to concur with House Amendment 1, which would require an update of -- of the summary on breast cancer. The second amendment was initiated by both the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Caucus on Adolescent Health. It changes references in several Acts from venereal disease to sexually transmitted diseases. I know of no opposition, and would urge the adoption of -- concurrence with both of these amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay, and the voting's 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 the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Woodyard, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Are you ready for announcements yet? May I alert the Members of the Senate Ag-Conservation Committee, there will be a meeting tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m., in Room 212. Shouldn't take too long. We have an amendment to the bill that deals with guard dogs, coney dogs, hot dogs, poodle dogs, or whatever other kind of dogs you want to deal with. 8:30.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purpose of -- purpose of an announcement. The Executive Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, immediately following Senator Woodyard's committee meeting in Room 212. And if you get there early, you can hear a little bit of the testimony on all the different dogs. But, actually, we have only three amendments, so if you're there on time, we can be out of there right away. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Hawkinson, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Purposes of an announcement. The Senate Judiciary Committee will meet at 9:30, in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

For purposes of two announcements. First announcement is in regard to the Public Health Committee, the Chairman of the Committee, Senator Raica, has asked me to announce that that committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., in Room A-1. My second announcement is in regard to the Education Committee. That will meet in the same room, A-1, at 10 a.m. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purpose of an announcement. The Executive Appointments Committee will be meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Note the time change, Members; it was originally scheduled for 10. It's been pushed back to 11 o'clock, in Room 212. We have twenty-eight individuals appearing in front of the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

committee tomorrow. Please be prompt. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Mahar, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MAHAR:

...(microphone cutoff)...announcement, Mr. President. The Senate Environment and Energy Committee will be meeting at 10:30, in a new room, 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR FAWELL:

For the purposes of an announcement. The Committee on Transportation will meet at 10 a.m., in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President, that the Senate Insurance Committee will meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, in Room 400. It should be a fairly brief meeting. And also, a further announcement that the Irish caucus will meet at 3 a.m. in the morning at -- under the -- under the streetlight at 2nd and Monroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Dunn. Ralph Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR R. DUNN:

Fine. Thank you, Mr. President. The Higher Education Committee will meet at -- at 8:30 in the morning in Room A-1. We have two amendments to consider. I urge everyone be on time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Peterson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PETERSON:

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

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1995

The Revenue Committee will meet at 10:30 a.m., in Room 400. And Senator Klemm has asked me to announce that the Local Government Committee will meet at 9:30, in Room A-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any other business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Weaver moves the Senate stand adjourned until noon, Monday, May 22nd.

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS PAGE: 001 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

96/09/11 16:18:36

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 21, 1995