PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of nine-thirty having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this morning by Dr. Lewis Rawls, Tabernacle Missionary Church, Chicago, Illinois. Doctor.

DR. LEWIS RAWLS:

(Prayer given by Dr. Lewis Rawls)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Reading of the Journal, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Journal of Friday, June 8, 1990.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

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

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Dunn. Any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, June 12th, and Wednesday, June 13th, in the year 1990, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Dunn. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so
ordered. Senator Brookins, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Reverend Rawls -- Reverend Dr. Rawls, who just gave the prayer and who is Senator for the day -- who is Chaplain for the day -- if there's any single person that I can credit for where I am today and the things that I have accomplished in my life - whatever they may be - should be credited to him as a mentor and the person that guided me when I was young and in my formative years. And for that I'd just like the records to reflect my thanks to him. He's eighty-four years old and will be eighty-five years old this year. I have known that he has been sick and has all the ailments of any other person. He laid in a coma for seven days and had opportunity to come to the hospital to visit him when he laid out his dreams and his wills to me, thinking that he would never have made it this far. That was something like twenty some years ago, now. And with that I would like my brother and sister in here in the Senate to know what high esteem I hold this gentleman in. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Dr. Rawls, welcome to Springfield. ...(machine cutoff).... All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. A Mr. Joe Howard has requested permission to use a video camera in the Senate Chamber for the production of an educational documentary. Without objection, leave is granted. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Hall, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, reports House Bill 3272 Do Pass. And House Bills numbered 3271,
3273, 3338, 3340, 3341, 3342, 3344 and 3541 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Smith, Chairman of the Committee on Public Health, Welfare and Corrections, reports House Bills numbered 3164 and 3777 Do Pass.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 101.

It is substantive.

And I have a like Message on House Joint Resolution 106, which is also substantive.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage -- passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2168 with House Amendments 1 and 2.

I have a like Message on Senate Bill 2231 with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 100 with House Amendment 4 and Senate Bill 1864 with House Amendments 2 and 3. Pardon me, and House Bill -- pardon me, and Senate Bill 1881 with House Amendment 1.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Secretary's Desk. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll begin on Page 22 on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. We will go through that order of business one time, and then we're out of

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1585.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

3rd Reading. 1681. Senator Dunn. Read the bill, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dunn, on Committee Amendment No. 1, Sir.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Committee Amendment No. 1 is a bill that passed -- that was lost in the House and I believe it got lost in the Senate on a roll call, and one I added to this bill. I'd move the adoption of Amendment No. 2 -- Amendment No. --
Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1762. Senator Madigan. Read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2875.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator DeAngelis offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Some of you may not be aware, but there are -- there is a maximum rate that a school district can charge. There is only one school district in the State of Illinois which has passed every referendum that is possible under
law - which has, in fact, exhausted all of its bonding sources. And that school district is School District 163 in Park Forest, which has a -- an educational tax rate of nine dollars and thirty-three cents per hundred of assessed valuation. What this bill would do is would allow those school districts who have reached the maximum in all their funds to be given an additional flat grant of three hundred and fifty dollars per pupil in average daily attendance. Be happy to answer any questions from --

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Senator, we -- this amendment would take seven hundred and forty-two thousand dollars of General Revenue Fund and give it to your school district in Park Forest. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGE LIS:

It would be given to the children in the school in that district. Yes. Not to me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERM AN:

I know it's not to you, but it's to that school district. And would you explain again why you are asking us to do this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGE LIS:

Because they have exhausted all possible sources for revenues
that they are capable of generating on their own. And I'm asking that we assist them, since they have shown so much in the way of trying to take care of themselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I rise in opposition to this amendment. There probably isn't a school district in the State that isn't in need of additional money - especially in need of additional State money. There are school districts, such as are represented by the Senator immediately to my rear, that could probably levy a nine-dollar rate and couldn't raise enough money to teach their kids at all. No. I'm talking about East St. Louis. This -- Senator Hall's district. And East St. Louis - I think it's ironic - that East St. Louis is probably the school district that ought to be in here with this amendment, instead of Park Forest. Now I would suggest to the sponsor of this amendment, that he withdraw it; come on back and we'll let them raise the maximum local tax-rate limit and let them go to referendum and increase their funding if they think that's necessary. But I think this would be a terrible precedent to set - to give three-quarters of a million dollars to an affluent suburban school district just because there is an arbitrary limit on their local ability to raise their money. I commend them for doing that, but that doesn't mean that just because they've gotten to that limit that they should then come in here and take three-quarters of a million dollars in this budget year when there's a long, long list of much more needy groups and individuals than the Park Forest School District that needs their money - needs our money - needs State dollars. Senator DeAngelis, you tried this before and you failed. I think that we ought to cause you to fail again this time. I urge a No vote.
Well, you know, Senator Berman, you're utterly amazing. This so-called affluent school district spends considerably less than what your impoverished Chicago school district spends. Their teachers are paid considerably less. These people have shown extraordinary effort on their own, and I guess, you know, one of the things that's happening in America, if you want to go ahead and do something on your own, somebody wants to slap you around. The fact of the matter is, these people have passed every single referendum that you can pass under law. They have tried to help themselves. And the fact of the matter is, is the tax rate has gone up, Senator Berman. The value of the homes has come down because of the high tax rate. The tax rate in this community is approaching sixteen dollars per hundred. And all they're asking for is an opportunity to give their children the type of education that they cannot provide on their own using the resources and the abilities that we in this Legislature have given them. Now if we don't let them go ahead and do that, then we, in fact, have an obligation to assist them. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Roll call is requested. All in -- all in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 12 Ayes, 31 Nays, and the amendment fails. Any further amendments?

No further amendments.
Fiscal note's been requested. On top of Page 24 appears House Bill 3-0-2-0. Senator Brookins. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3020.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3024.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Savickas offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas, Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, Amendment No. 1, offered by Representative McNamara -- its purpose is just to get this bill into a conference committee in case it's needed for -- and they get together on a financing plan for one of our suburban communities in Cook County. At this point, the bill does absolutely nothing, and unless the financing plan can be worked out with the Governor's Office, it will do nothing. So I would just put the amendment on and send it back over to the House when
we can.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 3-0-4-2. Senator Rock. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3-0-4-2.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Rock offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 was the one discussed in committee and is put on at the request of the committee. This is the -- the subject matter of House Bill 3042 is the question of inoculation for measles for postsecondary schools, and the concern is of the commuter students. And so this amendment says that the governing board of a postsecondary educational institution may authorize its chief administrator to except any of the following groups from such institution from the provisions of this Act. That is to say that the governing board of these institutions - like DePaul, the University of Illinois - can exempt their commuter students from
the necessity or the requirement to have proof of inoculation. I know of no objection. This is at the request of the U of I. And I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 3-0-6-5. Senator Savickas. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3065.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Savickas offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, Amendment No. 1 was put in at the request of the credit unions -- the Illinois Credit Union. And the purpose is to, in law, allow them to use their physical facilities for the sale of cars -- used cars, like from Hertz or Avis Rental or Budget, whatever the case may be. They do it now, and they feel that technically there may be a question, and they would like the law to reflect their concern. And I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, could I have your attention? I could -- Members of the Senate better listen to this proposed amendment. The new car and truck dealers oppose this proposed amendment, because what he's trying to do is put in a law something which is already being allowed by rule. A passage of this amendment would allow credit unions to sell vehicles, and act as a new car dealer without obtaining a license from the Secretary of State's Office. Could I have you attention over here please or have them be a little quiet, so I can hear what I am saying? Doris...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me, Senator Davidson. Please continue.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Presently, the Secretary of State's Office already allows for sales by licensed dealers to be conducted on a credit union premise. Secretary of State Office issues a supplemental license to licensed dealers, which enables them to conduct the sales anywhere in the State. This legislation is not necessary, 'cause credit unions are now allowed to conduct vehicle sales, by rule, by the Secretary of State's Office. In the past, we have passed legislation prohibiting this sale by persons not licensed at dealers, it was vetoed by the Governor and we unfortunately didn't override it. Again, Secretary of State is allowed, by rule, for the credit unions to conduct these vehicle sales now, and this amendment absolutely is unnecessary. You're going to allow credit unions, if this would be adopted and become law, to be a new car dealer - or a car dealer without subject to license regulations provisions under the Secretary of State's Office, and that's not good. I urge opposition to this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Any further discussion? Senator Savickas, to close.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Oh. Well, basically that is -- that is true, the question arises that since it is not in law that the credit unions are concerned that there will be a time when the rule may be changed, and they feel more secure that this, by being in law, would be a better benefit for the credit union and the people they serve. I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 12 Ayes, 27 Nays, and the amendment fails. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 3-0-9-0. Senator Watson. Out of the record. 3-1-5-3. Senator Jacobs. Out of the record. 3-1-6-7. Senator Fawell. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3167.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Fawell offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is the amendment that was asked by
the Judiciary Committee to be filed. It specifies that a satisfactory completion on an academic program while incarcerated in DOC is to be determined by the standards of the DOC's school district. And secondly, the amendment prohibits inmates convicted of murder, Class X felonies, from getting the additional educational good conduct credits provided by the bill, as well as inmates with a prior felony conviction for which they were incarcerated in DOC.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 3197. Senator Savickas. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3197.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Pardon me. Excuse me. Committee on Executive offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Committee Amendment No. 1, Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes. I have been informed that the person that offered that -- that should be Tabled. It was drawn in error, and I would move, at this point, that we do have another amendment to cover
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman moves to Table Committee Amendment No. 1. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. -- Committee Amendment No. 1 is Tabled. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Savickas offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas, Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Could you give me the number on that, Madam Secretary?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Surely.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. SDSH6H3197paml.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

MRV, yes. Yes. This amendment relates -- creates the Forest Park Civic Center Authority and retains the provisions of the original bill pertaining to the following civic center authorities: Macomb and Western, Boone County, Lake County, Urbana, Schuyler County and Atwood, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 2 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. This amendment is identical to the Senate amendment that was Tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me. Excuse me.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

-- it -- it takes out the eminent domain provisions. It was something that was already in the bill. This simply just makes it track and puts back that language. I move -- move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 3 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Senator Dunn. Ralph Dunn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dunn, Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. We passed the Senate Bill over to the House that had the Columbia Civic Center Authority in it, and the House held it in their Rules and didn't let it out, and this is putting this back into House Bill 3197. I ask for a favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment No. 4 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 4 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Senator Savickas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas, Amendment No. 5.
SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Is that LRB860971?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Madam Secretary, give him the LRB number.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No. The LRB is 8609716...

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

6RE. Yes. Yeah. That deals with Sections 4 and 7 on the application and the financial support forms and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Yes. Mr. President. I just don't have a copy of this amendment and don't understand what it does. Could we get an explanation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Could we have your attention, please? Senator Savickas, will you please explain your amendment again?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Okay. In Sections 4 and 7 - dealing with the base sum, an applicant with a facility of -- with more than four hundred thousand square feet of exhibition space shall have a base sum of fifteen million dollars in any event, and the applicant shall be eligible to receive up to fifty percent of its base sum in the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 1990, and the balance in the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 1991. And also, in Section 7, it deals with the total amount outstanding at any given time not to exceed ten million dollars. And with the grants and loans by the Secretary of State, a State librarian to public libraries and library systems.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Senator Karpel.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Mr....

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

I'm sorry. Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Mr. President. There is, I think, one more amendment that's going to be offered, and we've talked to our staff, and our staff has talked to the Republican staff, that over this weekend they were -- they are taking all these amendments to recodify it into one, and we will bring the bill back next week after they've gone over it, and adopt the one amendment that deals with this whole situation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR KEATS:

After that crystal clear explanation of the amendment, is this increasing the bond authorization which takes a three-fifths vote? I -- I honestly am just not sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Not to my knowledge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 5 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 5 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:
Amendment No. 6 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me. Senator Luft. You're light wasn't on. I didn't see it. Senator Luft, let's go back to Amendment No. 5. He had a question on it.

SENATOR LUFT:

I'm sorry, Mr. President, but I really don't understand this amendment at all, the one that Senator Savickas offered, which would have been No. ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

5.

SENATOR LUFT:

5. If I understand this correctly, first of all, can you tell me how many facilities exceed the four hundred thousand square feet of exhibition space? Are we talking about one facility?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas, the question is addressed to you. Would you please repeat the question, Senator Luft?

SENATOR LUFT:

This applies apparently to any facility with more than four hundred thousand square feet of exhibition space. How many facilities or civic centers would this apply to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I have no idea. I mean, what -- however they design them and build them. I don't know...(inaudible)...it would apply to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

The point that I am trying to make, Mr. President, is this specifically for one civic center in the State of Illinois?
Secondly, if it is not, then the way I read this, and my interpretation may be subject to fault, that someone like Senator Jacobs, who has a new civic center that will be certified July 1 of this year, would not be able to receive the twenty million dollars that, under present law, he would have coming to him, instead only fifteen million dollars, and then if you go farther back, you can only receive ten million of that within the fiscal year. Now I don't know whether I'm right or wrong, but there seems to me to be a lot of questions in my mind, and I would hope everybody else's mind, on just exactly what we're trying to do here, and if we cannot identify the civic centers or civic center that we are discussing in this amendment and specifically what we are trying to do, maybe we should reconsider or discuss it further.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. I guess -- I have -- I would like to see if the Senator would withdraw that for the time being and get the language to us and cleaned up. Otherwise I would ask for -- otherwise I would ask for -- having voted on the prevailing side, ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was taken.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

We will get back to that in a minute. Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. It's apparent that this bill is going to end up in a conference committee report anyway. I'm not delighted with this amendment, but we have -- already the Senate has put on several amendments. I think the sponsor's indicated that the bill is going to go to conference, and do what you want with this amendment, but I -- I really don't think it'll be in the final analysis.
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PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah. I have no qualms with what Senator Savickas is trying to
do. I just want to insure - and I think it was Senator Luft's
opinion also - that this does not affect the current funding of
the civic centers that are -- are going to be funded this year,
and if we have that commitment that that's the case from Senator
Savickas and that's the way it will come out in conference, I'd be
more than happy to withdraw my motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Well, Senator, I don't know how it is going to come out in
conference committee. I -- if we have five amendments already,
I'm sure that this bill will be thoroughly reviewed by not only
our staff, when they draw up the next amendment next week to make
sure that everything tracks and everything is technically correct.
I'm sure we will have the answers in that new amendment to
technically correct all of our tracking concerns, so I would say
let's keep moving and get it going.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further amendments? Amendment No. 5 is adopted. Any
further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Amendment No. 6, Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Proceed. Post haste.
SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senate Amendment No. 6 permits those civic centers who have more than four hundred thousand square feet to be eligible for the twenty-million-dollar-base sum on July 1st, 1990,...(inaudible)...it's almost the same -- instead of July 1, 1991. Simply changes the effective date a year earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 6 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 6 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Schuneman, Amendment No. 7.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is another of the series of amendments that would create civic centers. This one has to do with the Prophetstown Civic Center, which the Senate acted on in Senate Bill 1558, but has been held up in House Rules. So I would adopt -- or move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 7 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 7 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. 3214. Senator Zito. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3214.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
103rd Legislative Day June 14, 1990

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3310.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Fawell offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator -- Senator Fawell.

SENIOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is the amendment that I said I would put on in the committee, which guarantees that there should be no tax increase in this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Rigney.

SENIOR RIGNEY:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENIOR RIGNEY:

In the balcony, in fact, on both the Republican and Democratic side of the balcony, we have a group of Northern Illinois 4-H'ers
103rd Legislative Day June 14, 1990

who are here on their State Citizenship Focus Program, I'd like to welcome to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Give them a nice warm welcome. Any discussion on Amendment No. 1? Question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Fawell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Fawell, Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This is an amendment that says that the Forest Preserve Rangers shall have jurisdiction over the territory that is owned, leased or licensed by the district and property over which the district has easement rights, but once they get outside of the forest preserve, they shall have to act in aid of the regular police force in such city or village, and then shall be subject to the direction of the chief of police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 2 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Leave of the Body, Senator Zito will handle House Bill 3312. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3312.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
103rd Legislative Day

June 14, 1990

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3318. Senator Smith. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3318.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senators Smith and Brookins offer Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Smith, Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment would -- House Bill 3318, Amendment No. 1, retains the original bill and inserts House Bill 3483, which requires the Department of Public Aid to negotiate a written agreement with the Department of Corrections to implement procedures for pre-release applications and expeditious processing of requests for public assistance filed by persons scheduled for release from the State penal facilities. Each qualified applicant shall receive an assistance check or an emergency assistance grant within ten days of their release.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion?

SENATOR SMITH:
I move...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Berman, Smith, Marovitz and Severns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Berman, Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 is what we call the spousal impoverishment amendment, and what that does is to adopt, in statutory form, the present rule of the Department of Public Aid, which provides for the maximum allowance for spouses for a person who is requiring medical aid under our Public Aid Code. Be glad to respond to any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 2 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Last year during Statewide hearings, the Joint Committee on Welfare Reform made a proposal to have the Department of Public Aid furnish certain dental and eye services to Medicaid recipients who are participating in educating educational training or employment programs, such as Project Chance. The Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago is
supporting this amendment -- yes -- and what we do with the amendment is simply require DPA to furnish the dental and eye services to Medicaid recipients, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 3 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Senator Smith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Smith, Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment merely makes the bill, as amended by Senate Amendment No. 1, 2, 3 and immediately -- effective immediately, and I move for the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment No. 4 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 4 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


SECRETARY HAWKER:
103rd Legislative Day  

June 14, 1990

House Bill 3426.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

On the amendment, Senator Savickas. You're going to have to withdraw it.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Mr. President, I don't have the copy of the amendment in my file, but it is -- all the amendment does is ask -- state that there shall be a one-year moratorium. No permit shall be issued for any hazardous waste -- hazardous waste incinerator until 12-31-91, so that we, as a Legislature, can plan and have policies set on just where and in what condition we would allow these types of incinerators to be built, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman moves the adoption of the amendment. Is there any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Senator Brookins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Would the -- would the maker of the amendment yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Committee Amendment No. 1. Senator Savickas moved the adoption. On that question -- indicates he'll yield. Senator Savickas will yield.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Yes. Thank you. Senator Savickas would you tell me what effect this would have on the incinerator in -- in Robbins?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:
None. That's a municipal waste incinerator. This deals strictly with hazardous waste; it has nothing at all to do with municipal waste.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment No. 1 be adopted. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator J.E. Joyce offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3426 would preclude the Illinois Finance Development Authority from funding or assisting in the funding of construction of incinerators. I have spent the better part of the last four months trying to understand this incinerator issue, and it is rare indeed when someone stands up in this Chamber and asks the Body to support legislation that precludes two hundred million dollars in State assistance from going into his district. So it is a very difficult thing from that perspective to do it. Anyone who would oppose this amendment would do it on the basis that, one, they would want an incinerator to be in their district; and two, they would want State assistance for that incinerator. I will represent to this Chamber that there is no incinerator going to be built in this State which will not involve a lawsuit, which will not become highly controversial, and which will not come to the people of your district with a high degree of uncertainty as
to what the health impact of that would be on those people. So I am saying to this Chamber, if you -- if you wish to avoid all of those problems which may lay around the corner for you, you will support Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3-4-2-6.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Joyce, did I hear you say that this would preclude two hundred million dollars to -- to go into the construction of an incinerator by the Illinois Finance Authority?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

It would do that specifically short term. It would preclude forever - as long as the legislation is in effect - from the Authority being involved in the construction -- financing the construction of incinerators.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. To the amendment, Mr. President and Members of the -- of the Senate. I know what the sponsor's attempting to do, but I don't think this Body should be in the posture of passing legislation of this type and also spreading scare tactics. We who are in government have to make tough decisions. No one wants incinerators. No one wants our solid waste to be dumped into waste dumps. We are in a dilemma, and as for us in this Body to
fan the flames of fear as relate to incinerators, is something that we should not be caught in. This is a very bad amendment, because I see nothing basically wrong with the safe affectionation of solid waste. Until we, as leaders, stand up to our responsibility and stop fanning the flames as relate to the -- the disposal of solid waste, we're going to be caught in this dilemma. The -- the landfills in the Chicagoland area has about a two-year capacity left in them. No one wants the garbage. But they want to take it to somewhere else. But those persons where you take it don't want it. For us to pass a -- to have an amendment of this nature, is just fanning flames -- flames of indecisiveness about -- as relate to members of government not knowing -- not getting the facts as relate to incineration of garbage. This is a very poor amendment. The community is not in my district, but I am familiar with the community that I know the Senator's concerned with is one of the poorest communities in this State. There is nothing wrong with incineration if it is safe, but we have to stand up to our responsibilities and tell the people the truth, and not give them the unnecessary rhetoric to make them fear a disposal of solid waste. This amendment should be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

I don't think many of us are focusing. Would everybody on the Floor who understands what this issue is all about, please raise your hand? All right. That's nine. The other forty-some of us would like to know what you're trying to do, Senator. Is this aimed at a particular thing in your district? Is it a Statewide thing? Are we forever closing the door on incineration? Or, you know, what are we doing? The other forty of us that are not focused on this issue would appreciate some specific rationales
and explanations of what's going on here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

Senator Schaffer, if you were listening to me, would you raise your hand? Well, raise your hand. I am trying to explain, from every possible perspective, why I put this in, and I am trying to rationalize to you why you should support this amendment. If you have an incinerator proposed for your district, I assure you it will not be constructed without a lawsuit. I assure you, after listening to experts for four months, that there is no way you are going to come away convinced that that is safe, and will not have an impact on the health of the people of your district. And I assure you that it will be highly controversial. Given that -- given those premises, I cannot understand why the State should choose to assist in the financing of something like that. If, in fact, a project like that goes forward, then it seems to me that it should be financed in a conventional manner. There are far less controversial, far more deserving, and far easily understood projects that can use State dollars than something such as this.

Now I could give you specifics if we want to talk the -- about the Robertson Center. I can tell you about representations that this was state-of-the-art, the -- the -- the -- the finest technology going into this, and then two or three months subsequent to that representation, find out from the Federal Government that there was technology available that was significantly reduced -- nitrous oxide emissions that was being ignored. We can go on and on. There's no one in this Chamber who has -- who has worked as hard for Robbins and has been as concerned about their economic situation. The overwhelming majority of the people of Robbins are against this. That's to the specific. Generally, I would suppose, Jack, where you come from, you would say, "This is great.
Two hundred million dollars of State money is not going up into Cook County." That alone should merit your support, given your historical approach to -- to this -- to these matters.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

My understanding is, this amendment applies to both municipal waste incinerators and hazardous waste incinerators?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

To all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I think we should make a distinction here when we talk about incinerators, and the distinction should be between hazardous waste incinerators and municipal waste incinerators. I think this is a good amendment if it applied only to hazardous waste incinerators. I think those should be paid for by individual companies. They should be responsible for bearing that burden. But when it comes to municipal waste incinerators, what we have right now is a group of counties meeting to form plans to determine how to get rid of their waste. And one of the options they have is incineration. If we take away financing from the State, what's going to happen is it's going to make that option less viable, less of the priority in their mind. In addition, if we make it more expensive to build municipal waste incinerators, what I think is going to happen is the cost for the additional financing will be borne by the residents who put your garbage out by your curb. It's not going to be assumed or absorbed by the company. It's going to be passed on to individual consumers,
individual residences. So what I'm afraid will happen - and I'm not raising this to scare anybody - but I would think that those counties that have a property tax that includes your garbage pickup, that would have to be raised to pay any additional cost. In the State we have a priority set in the Environmental Protection Act; we set five priorities. And recently we all received, I think, a copy of the green papers that were issued on -- on Earth Day, setting forth environmental issues on sixteen different subjects, and in that group of papers there's one particular paper on solid waste. And in that, the environmentalists have said that they take credit for setting the priorities in the State of Illinois for how we dispose of waste. And let me tell you what those five priorities are, because we still have those priorities. Number one is reduction of waste at the source. If we don't produce it, we don't have a problem. The second priority, that all of us supported and voted for, is recycling waste or reusing it. The third priority in the State is incineration for energy. If you take garbage, burn it, create energy, at least you get something back as opposed to putting the same garbage in a landfill and letting it sit there forever and nobody gets anything. The fourth priority is incineration without energy being produced, and our fifth and last priority is landfilling. If the alternative were incinerating our garbage or recycling it, I would be for recycling and every one of us here would be for recycling. At this point in time we don't have the technology to do that. The alternative to incineration of municipal waste right now is landfilling. And while the questions on incineration are unknown as to what effect they have on the environment, we do know what effect landfills have on the environment, and the effect is they all leak. The State EPA has said so. Any one of you who's had a landfill in your district knows that's the truth. They all leak. What we have is the known
against the unknown. As far as what Senator Joyce said about monitoring, there is — and I think that there should be — a provision put in here that any municipal or any hazardous waste incineration has to have a monitor directly connected to the State EPA. We shouldn't have to pay to have somebody out at the incinerator twenty-four hours a day. They can build monitors to monitor the chemicals that we are worried about, and have that information directly piped into the EPA on a television screen that they can have somebody watch. The -- the incineration question is one that we haven't really wrestled with in the past. But what we have done three years ago, is allow each county to decide what their priorities are. I think this may hinder them in deciding on those priorities. If it were only limited to hazardous waste, it'd support it, but without limiting it solely to that, I really don't think this is a good idea. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Would the sponsor of the amendment yield to a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce, indicates he will.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Senator Joyce, I'm a little bit confused, because I have kind of a dual personality here, being a Mayor and a Senator. Now does your amendment -- does your amendment prohibit the incineration of hazardous wastes as well as municipal wastes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

My amendment prohibits the financing, by the Authority, of incinerators. All incinerators.
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Would you consider withdrawing your amendment, or putting an amendment on that would apply only to hazardous wastes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

I think I already answered that question.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'm sorry, but I didn't hear your answer, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ):

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, we don't want to increase landfills -- Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, and the alternative might be incineration, and I don't think we should go ahead with this amendment. In fact, this is one of the few times that I really concur with Senator Welch's argument. I think it should have been separated - hazardous waste from municipal waste - and I can see why we wouldn't want to fund on the hazardous waste, but I'm afraid that, from my experience as a Mayor and well as a Senator, I can tell you right now, there has to be some alternative to landfills and yet, what are we doing about it? I've had calls from septic tank operators saying, "Where are we going to put our garbage? If we don't have a place to put it or do something with it, we're going to stick it in culverts, we're going to stick it in sewers and what-have-you." I mean what's the alternative? I
have to, regrettably, speak against this amendment, and I stated my conflict already.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This unfairly hurts a project that enjoys strong local support -- local government support. There's no basis for it. We should not pick and choose among the projects that we otherwise qualify for financing, and certainly create exemptions merely because one of us may not like a particular project. So we need to defeat this. I have talked with IPA <sic>; they assured me that this will monitored closely. The -- the -- the -- the mayor of the town where this incinerator is going -- I have talked with her to great lengths. It is -- seems to be the only salvation, and therefore I ask that this amendment be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. As much as I respect the -- the sponsor of this amendment, and I understand what he's trying to do, I think as a downstater we have to look at it from the standpoint and -- and it's been alluded to here quite often -- and that is, you know, should we be closing the door on incineration as an alternative. The -- the commission is -- I mean the Energy and Environment Committee is currently looking at the possibility of -- of what we should be doing with incineration in a number of other areas, and I think that we should see the outcome of that study before we -- we -- we try to introduce legislation such as this. Because I would agree with Senator Welch, that if any of these incinertors are -- are going to be built, especially for municipal waste, at that particular point in time, we are going to
have a -- a distinct need in downstate in -- in order to be able to help fund these. So, I -- I -- I understand what the sponsor is trying to do, and -- and I sympathize with what he is trying to do, but I think it just may be a little premature, and I ask for a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Senator Joyce, is the State Representative in whom -- in whose district the incinerator is going to be in, that you're trying to stop, in support of this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

The -- Representative McNamara is supporting this. Representative Keane, who -- who is the other Representative in my district, is opposed to it, but I never knew that to be the criteria for voting Yes or No on anything in this Chamber.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Well, I'm not suggesting it is, because I felt if there was any validity to your suggestion, it would be based on the fact that someone who represents the area has a preference. It's my knowledge, however, that the person who is the representative does not support this amendment. But to the amendment itself, first of all, let me clear up. This bill -- or this Agency that you're trying to prohibit from doing this does not use State funds. So
we ought to correct the record, that we are not, in fact, prohibiting the use of State funds, because there are no State funds regardless. The second thing is, I think what's going to occur here, is this passes, is you're going to try to stop someone from getting a cold by applying a tourniquet to their neck, so they don't breathe. The fact is we do have need for -- as Senator Welch - and he and I generally don't find ourselves on the same side of an issue environmentally - but he is absolutely correct. I would suggest that if you have some serious concerns with this incinerator being near the area that you represent, that you not, in fact, punish the entire State in order to get that resolved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady from Cook, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

I -- I agree with Senator DeAngelis. I think Senator Brookins basically expressed my concerns that this particular amendment really is targeted at a very specific incinerator, and that area is in very dire need of some more tax revenue. As a matter of fact, unless we do something to support that local government is going to be -- going to be looking at something on the same level as we are in East St. Louis. While I can appreciate the -- the sponsor and the Representative from that district trying to respond to the wishes of some of the people out there, but I think we have a responsibility to be practical here. I think the EPA has basically given us some -- some assurance that there is no danger, and it's part of our responsibility to help to educate the public to the reality of what exists. Those fears are natural, but if we are concerned, and doing our job, then what we will do is try and explain to the people out there that there is no danger and that there will be closely -- that these projects will be closely monitored. Most certainly we have to do something with our garbage, and this is a way to do that and at the same time
provide to boost -- the -- the local economy of that -- of the Village of Robbins, and for that reason, I think we should defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce, to close.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:

Well, very briefly. First of all, I'd like to address Senator DeAngelis, who likes to put out the -- his analogy on a tourniquet. Hey, Aldo, I got a message for you. Listen up. Your -- your -- your analogy on a tourniquet, you know, it was real cute. You know shutting off someone's air supply to cure their cold, but, in fact, you know, you are tampering with this -- this incinerator is tampering with the supply of air to someone. As far as -- as State monies being involved or not being involved, you know, you're bordering close -- that -- that's close to being almost fraudulent with us. State monies are involved when we start talking about putting out two hundred million dollars. Who's paying the salaries of the people that are administering this whole process? Come off it. How about Bechtel. Bechtel, Aldo. Bechtel. Did you ever hear of him? Bechtel, okay. That's who's building this. So, you know, you vote whatever way you want to vote. If I came to you, and I said I want ten million dollars for my district or twenty million, or I have a project that is important for health or education or welfare or the black people of Robbins or whatever, and I want you to support ten-million-dollar assistance, such as we're talking about here, two hundred million dollars. You would put me up against the wall and extract everything you could possibly extract from me to do this. But you are gratuitously standing up here today and making this pitch. You know, up or down, I ask for a -- for an Aye vote on -- on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, on a point of personal privilege. Senator Joyce, I voted whence a representative from a district did not want an incinerator breakup, because that area didn't want it. In this instance, this community wants this incinerator. Okay? And -- and -- wait a minute. Let me finish mine. Just a second. And the representative from that district, I am led to believe, wants it also. Now, I said to you, in addition to that, I also represent the south suburbs. And the south suburban mayors and managers is working on a plan that might, in fact, involve incineration. Now you're asking me to turn around and oppose all the efforts that are going on voluntarily by people, because you happen to have an objection to that. And I said to you, if you have an objection, narrow your objections to that particular thing, but you're trying to kill every incinerator in the State with your proposal. And I also want to correct you, that IDFA does not take a single dollar of State money for administrative costs or otherwise. They're, in fact, a free-standing, self-supporting, income-generating agency. And the monies -- as the chairman of the audit commission, I can tell you right now, I know that. Okay? But the point is, if you have an objection, and I -- if you wanted to kill that incinerator that's in your district, be my guest, and I would probably support you. But what you're doing right here is you're killing the entire State, as Senator Welch said. And you're also killing the plans for the south suburban area, who in fact, right now, is presenting a plan very shortly for handling the waste of that area. And that's what my objection is. And I'm not personalizing it, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.E. JOYCE:
Well, you know, we can beat this thing and beat this thing. You never went to one meeting, Aldo. You don't know what the people out there in that district out there are for or against. You know, there's all kinds of other things operating here, things that you well know about and are better left unsaid in this Chamber. So vote it up or down.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Amendment No. 2 be adopted. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 11 Ayes, 32 Nays. The amendment fails. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator J.E. Joyce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Joyce withdraws the amendment. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Kustra.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Kustra, Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I introduced this amendment because I was convinced that it would come to the assistance of the citizens of the Bedford Park area in their fight against the proposed incinerator. Since that time I have discussed this matter with the sponsors, Senators Savickas and -- and Raica. They have convinced me that in order to move this bill as expeditiously as possible, out of the Senate and over -- back to the House, they should do so without amendments that might cloud the issue and along the way, do harm to the bill. That's the last thing I would want to do and so, at their urging,
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I withdraw this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Gentleman withdraws Amendment No. 3. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:
Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Karpel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Senator Karpel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:
Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 3426 basically says that in counties with the population of a hundred thousand or more, a sanitary landfill or incinerator designed to accept municipal waste cannot receive a permit, "unless that county has adopted a solid waste management plan, under the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act." The purpose of this bill is to, first of all, to perhaps encourage the counties to hurry up with their plans, because there are several incinerators as we have heard, there are landfills being proposed, and I think that the counties should be getting about the business of passing -- of getting their plans in place before we willy-nilly go siting other landfills, and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:
I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)
Indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR WELCH:
Senator Karpel, if a -- if a county comes back with a waste management plan that says, "We don't want incinerators," would your amendment prohibit one of the towns or private corporation from trying to get a permit within that county for an incinerator? Would that -- would that be barred by the County Waste Management
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Plan?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well I don't know the specifics of the -- of the Act, but I don't know that the county plan -- a county plan that -- that was worded that way, or included that, would be acceptable by the Agency. Let me just read the rest of this amendment. It says that the solid waste management plan "under the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act and that plan has been reviewed by the Agency and found to comply with the requirements of that Act." So I don't know if that Act would allow a county to have that type of a plan. They -- the county plan would have to be, you know, acceptable under the -- under the Act, and I don't think that that situation could occur.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Pending -- if -- if a county does not have a plan, they cannot burn -- they cannot build an incinerator under this amendment. That -- that's basically what you are trying to do. Is that -- is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

That's correct. They cannot -- what it says is - it has to do
with municipal waste by the way, this has nothing to do with the New Bedford situation. "The Agency shall not issue any permit for the development or construction, in any county" of a -- "with a population of a hundred thousand or more, of a sanitary landfill or incinerator designed to accept municipal waste, unless that county has adopted a solid waste...plan under the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act, and that plan has been reviewed by the Agency and found to comply with the requirements of that Act." I think that there are a lot of counties that are planning to site landfills before they have their plan in place. And I think it only fair to the people of those counties to at least know that they -- that their county has a plan - to have perhaps seen it, the municipalities are aware of it, and they have something to hang their possible objections on, or their approval on. But I do think that -- that since these plans are due to go into effect in March of next year, that this might encourage them to hurry up and get it done before they go ahead and site another landfill or incinerator in their county.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I'm not sure that's going to have that effect. If a county -- let's say LaSalle County, where I'm from, doesn't come up with a waste management plan, the State EPA cannot permit a landfill or an incinerator in LaSalle County. Correct? Because it's over one hundred thousand. Well then, it would seem to me if I were sitting on the waste management committee, and I wanted to keep out landfills from LaSalle County, I'd -- I'd delay that plan for as long as I could. Because the State will not permit either an incinerator or a landfill in my county, if I do that, and the counties that are under one hundred thousand are not subject to this moratorium, which is basically what it is, so those counties
would still be subject to the EPA siting a landfill within their jurisdiction. I -- I think the wording on that -- I -- I understand what you're trying to do. I think the wording is not the way you want it to be, because what you're doing is giving the seventeen counties over a hundred thousand population the ability to stop permitting of incinerators or landfills in their counties, just by delaying the plan. So I'm not sure what the impetus is to speed it up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Good. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well I'll -- I'll associate by saying -- myself with the same question and ask her to respond to that, because I'm -- I'm on the same wavelength there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Karpiel, would you want to respond?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, I think the counties already have siting approval, so they could delay it or deny a permit now. What we are trying to do with this amendment is to get them to adopt -- these larger counties to adopt their plans. It is a lot of the counties that are proposing these landfills, not some outside interests that are proposing the landfills. The counties are siting them. There's -- and they're doing so without having a plan that has been adopted. So that they're not really tied to anything right now. They're not -- and the municipalities and the people have nothing really to fight them on, or -- or to use as a guide, or a basis of why the counties are doing this. There is a -- there is in western Kane County, for instance, there is a -- that affects -- it's pretty close to DeKalb County. The county is proposing to site a two-thousand-acre landfill. A thousand-acre landfill and a thousand for a buffer zone. I mean, that is a mega-dump of
magnificence proportions. The landfills that are now present, for instance, in DuPage County, run about four hundred and fifty thousand acres. I mean, four hundred and fifty acres. These -- this is a thousand-acre landfill. And the people there have really no recourse, because it's the county that is siting it. And all I'm saying is that the county -- not saying that they can't site one -- not saying that they -- that landfills are going to be outlawed forever, but that they should at least adopt a plan before they go ahead and put in these landfills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Schaffer. I'm sorry. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

It is -- it's my understanding that the counties now must already adopt a solid waste plan before they can be permitted. I think -- all -- if that's true, then I think what you're saying -- and I think Senator Welch is right -- all you are saying is -- is that you are granting this option to those sixteen or seventeen communities that are a hundred thousand or more, but you are not doing anything for the rest of those communities outside of that population base. And it's my understanding that that is already the law, is it not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

All the counties in the State are required under the -- an Act that we recently passed, the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act -- all the counties in the State are required to come up with a plan. Those over a hundred thousand population have to come up with a plan by March 1991 -- March 1st. Those with under a hundred thousand have until 1995. And if you wanted to put on an amendment to affect them also by this, that's one thing. But I'm concerned about the larger counties that are all hurrying up to
site landfills before they are mandated to put in place their plan, which is coming up next March, and would not hurt them to either get their plan in place sooner than March, or to wait with siting of a landfill until after their plan goes into effect -- or till they've presented their plan. We're not asking them to wait till 1995; we're only asking them to wait either until March 1st, 1991, or to get their plan in place. I just simply think it's unfair to the people of an area to be getting landfills sited right next to them, when their county hasn't even bothered to put in fact -- put in place a coherent, logical, thought-out plan of what they should be doing about the landfills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Hello -- hello. Thank you. I rise in support of this amendment. I think those of us who purport to be for recycling, and composting, and waste reduction, recognize that once an area has sited a large landfill, their interest in those programs tends to diminish dramatically. If you're -- truly are interested in real recycling -- real waste reduction -- real composting, one does not want these landfills sited, or incinerators sited, without the existence of a comprehensive solid waste plan. I think this is a very reasonable amendment, and one that will go a long way to safeguarding the environment. I'm a little amazed at some of the questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, in my county, it says it has a solid waste plan and probably won't take place for another three years. In the meantime, the garbage is going to accumulate and what have you, and if this bill will
push the counties to get something done, timely, instead of waiting for years, while the garbage piles up, I certainly will be for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Karpiel, to close.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, I don't want to take up any more time of the Senate, except to ask for an Aye vote. And to stress that this is -- this is not something to deny counties, municipalities, or anyone from -- for putting in landfills or incinerators. It's a safeguard, and I think it's a logical approach to the situation of -- since we are mandating these plans, this is just asking them to wait until they site something, till they have their plan in place. That's all we're asking. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Question is, shall Amendment No. 3 be adopted. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 34 Ayes, 9 Nays. Amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

3rd Reading. Senator Severns, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

It's my honor today to have joining us in the President's
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Gallery, Chuck Keppler and some of the employees from our local Caterpillar plant in Decatur, Illinois, and I would like the Senate to join me in welcoming them here today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Will they please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. The Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I have two fine families visiting us today from Winthrop Harbor and Zion area. Of course I feel I have the best constituents. They're none other than the Dan Hunt -- Dan Hunt and his family, and Dave Cook and his family. And they're up here in the President's Gallery.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3521.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:
Senator Jones offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jones, Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 requires all insurance companies doing business in this State to file with the Director of Insurance, by zip code, the number of automobile insurance policies in effect, the average premium for liability coverage, the average premium for comprehensive coverage, the average incurred loss under liability, as well as the average incurred loss for comprehensive coverage, and the average limit of coverage for each policy - liability and comprehensive. The insurance industry compiled this data at the hearing we had, so we just want them to file this information with the Department of Insurance. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me. Can we break up the caucuses in the -- in the aisles, please?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

We just now received one copy of this amendment, and I don't think it has been distributed to the Members. I'm not sure exactly what the effect of this amendment is, but it appears to me, Mr. -- Mr. President, that the amendment may not be germane to the bill. The bill amends the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act and the State Finance Act. The amendment seeks to amend the Insurance Code, and I would request a ruling from the Chair on that, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LECHOWICZ)
All right. While we are waiting for the Parliamentarian, let me just introduce to this Body a former Speaker of the House, our good friend, Speaker Bill Redmond. Bill. Welcome to Springfield. Good to see you. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, then -- then I would, while you're doing that, Mr. President, if I may direct some questions to the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, this -- this report that you're seeking to have made is obviously something that would be a new and additional report that is not now currently made. Insurance companies are required by law to make certain reports, and frankly I'm not sure, at this point, what -- how burdensome this specific additional report that you're requesting would be. Could you explain to us the purpose of -- of developing this information?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. In -- in response to that question, the industry compiled all this data to the hearing we had in Chicago, as relate to the automobile insurance. The -- there's been many complaints about the -- the -- but from consumers about the high rates in certain areas and zip codes that are used to compile these rates because of the high cost. So the industry compiled this data, and once the data is made public, then the one would know whether or not they have been -- their rates are justified, as such. It's nothing new, because they are already compiled and that they indicated such. So all this does is make it available for the public to have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)
SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well I -- I tend to agree with you that the information is now compiled and reported probably to the Department of Insurance. My question, though, I -- I don't believe they're now required to do it twice a year, and I don't know what the cost impact would be. I guess I would ask you, Senator, have -- have -- have you gotten any reports from the Department of Insurance as to whether or not this is doable, and whether or not it is something that would be of any value once we get the -- the information?

SENATOR JONES:

As -- as it stands right now in the reports that are filed, it's just on the average, but it doesn't break it down to the respective zip codes for each category. They compile it in computing rates. And how valuable would it be? It would be quite valuable, because you know the arguments that I have raised and many others have raised as it relate to the high cost of -- of insurance premiums in certain zip codes. And the industry says, "Well, because of the losses in that zip code." Then perhaps this can take away that such things, that in order for them to -- to figure the rates they must have this information, which they do. They indicated they do have it. All I want to do is make it public, so therefore, -- if it is accurate, then we would no longer have to go through the scenario of fighting about the rates in certain areas of the State. And that's all that it does.
Yes...

The answer is yes. Senator Schuneman, the bill is a bill that deals with the Illinois motor vehicle -- motor vehicles. The amendment refers to and is also dealing with motor vehicle insurance. It is therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, that the amendment is therefore germane. Senator Schuneman.

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, for purpose of the Members and their consideration of their vote on this, I'm advised that this same amendment, which is opposed by the Department of Insurance, I am told now, was tried in the House yesterday and failed there. I suspect that probably the best course is to -- is to follow the example of the House and -- and not adopt the amendment.

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to speak in strong support of this amendment. From -- as a resident currently of Chicago, but also as someone who has off and on over the years been concerned about the -- the uneven pattern of automobile insurance and the kinds of arguments that we've gotten in defense of that, rarely backed up by any facts, it seems to me that it is absolutely essential for any kind of a rational policy with respect to regulation of insurance companies, that this information be available, and I guess the only startling part is that it has not been available in the past. So it seems to me that if we are ever going to settle this argument about whether
insurance rates are fairly or unfairly being imposed in different parts of the State, then this is exactly the kind of information that we ought to have. I think it is a very important amendment, and I certainly hope it is adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Senator Jones, I have a concern that the district that I represent, for example Shelbyville, Illinois, would not have the same kind of traffic jam that the Dan Ryan in Chicago has. And therefore, the debate over zip codes and insurance policies that has long been going on, ultimately, I believe, will help influence the rate of insurance paid in various areas. Is that the intent of this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

No. This is just a public disclosure amendment. All it does is require the insurance companies writing automobile insurance to file with the Department the -- the statistics as -- as spelled out in this amendment. In -- in your area, I believe, is whatever the zip code in that area, then the people would know. You may be paying too much. You follow me? But all it does is make this information available to you. This is the information that they used to compile rates in the State of Illinois, and if it is available, then I think you should know about it. And that's all that it does.
SENATOR SEVERNS:

Is it -- is it not the first step to award determining rates in various different areas of the State of Illinois, and would it not as a result, result in higher rates in downstate Illinois - especially rural areas of the State?

SENATOR JONES:

No. That is not so. It is used to determine rates right now. All it will make available to you is that information, as to what they use to compile to determine the rates. It has nothing to do with rating whatsoever. All it does is give you the information in the zip code that you reside in, all the necessary information that the insurance companies now compile, and lets you know why your rates are what they are. It doesn't have anything to do with the rates in your area at all. All it does is give you the information that make it available publicly.

SENATOR JONES:

Further discussion? If not, Senator Jones, do you wish to close?

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. As the -- one of the minority spokesmen indicated that what the House had done and what the Department's requested -- during the hearings we had in Chicago, the industry indicated that they compiled this information and there have been many, many complaints upstate, downstate as to why their rates are what they are. So all the amendment does is give -- make available to the Department, which the Department will make public, what they use to compile the rates. That's all that it does. The industry is
currently doing it, and all we want to do is make it public so everyone will have access to it, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there -- all those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. Senator -- Senator Schuneman has requested a roll call. Senator Jones moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 22 -- I'm sorry -- the Ayes are 23, the Nays are 24, 1 voting Present. The amendment fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Chair would like to recognize a group from Southwestern High School that are -- that is here visiting with us. Will our guests please rise and be recognized by the Senate. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JONES:

Verify the negatives.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Jones has requested a verification of those Members who voted in the negative. We are still on this order of business, so Madam Secretary. Senator Jones has requested a verification of those Members who voted in the -- in the negative. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the negative: Barkhausen, Davidson, Donahue, Ralph Dunn, Etheredge, Fawell, Friedland, Hawkinson, Hudson, Karpiel, Keats, Lechowicz, Madigan, Maitland,
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Philip, Rea, Rigney, Schaffer, Schuneman, Severns, Topinka, Watson, Weaver and Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones, do you question the presence of any Member who voted in the negative?

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Rea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SENATOR JONES:

Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver is sitting in his seat.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Keats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Keats is at Senator Philip's desk, getting his instructions.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Maitland.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland is at the back of the Chamber.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Donahue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Donahue is in the -- in the aisle.

SENATOR JONES:

No further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. On that -- on that question, the Ayes are 23, the Nays are 23, 1 voting Present. The amendment fails. Further
amendments? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:
Request a verification of the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman has requested a verification of those who voted in the affirmative.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:
Mr. President -- Mr. President...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:
Could we have the roll call, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

On that question, the Ayes are 23, the Nays are 23, 1 voting Present. But you are certainly entitled to poll those who voted in the affirmative.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well thank you for that, Mr. President, but I think I'll withdraw my request.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Schuneman withdraws his request. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Molly Hall, reporter for Channel 3 in Champaign has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Top of Page 28. Top of Page 29. House Bill 3565. Senator Severns. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise? Oh, I beg your pardon. Let's take 3565 out of the record. This might be the -- Page 28, I skipped a bill at the top of that Page. There was one substantive bill there. The rest are the
appropriation bills. With leave, we will return to House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3529, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3529.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 is a technical clean-up amendment, as adopted in committee as relate to refunds of unearned premiums, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Jones offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 <sic> contains provisions of Senate Bill 1741, which passed out of this Body, except we included in there language that would limit the -- the oral -- oral presentation for quotations for insurance over the phone to cities over five
hundred thousand. Also the bill prohibits the insurance companies from imposing surcharges or refusing to insure a applicant based solely on the identity of the applicant's previous insurance carrier. Automobile insurers and insurance producers have provide applicants the oral and telephone estimates -- requires insurance companies selling automobile insurance to disclose, upon request, the names and addresses of their authorized producers nearest to the resident of the person making the request, and we have discussed this with the minority spokesman and I believe the amendment is agreed to, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The sponsor has worked with us on this amendment, and he has worked with the industry and the producers. And to the best of my knowledge, everybody is in agreement now, that -- that this amendment should be adopted. So I'd urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jones has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 <sic> -- those in favor, indicate by saying -- Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

...further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SENATOR SMITH:
Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

What purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SMITH:

I have a bill here, 3580.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

What's -- what was -- what's your number?

SENATOR SMITH:


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm sorry. I inadvertently called Senator Marovitz. With leave of the Body, we will return back to Page 29. House Bill 3580, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3580.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This -- on House Bill 3580 -- the amendment merely deletes all, and inserts House Bill 3584, which extends due process protection to private agency foster parents in administrative appeals. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.
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PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Smith offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment No. 2 merely clarifies the procedure for the initial review of a private agency's decision. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Smith has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of Page 29 is 3614. Senator Topinka.


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3632.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3656 is the substantive amendment that becomes the bill. It creates seven stormwater management planning councils in Cook County, to develop stormwater management plans for four established watersheds areas. It's an agreed-to amendment. It's been worked out. There was no opposition in committee. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3656
would reinstate House Bill 3367, and incorporate that language into this bill, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2's adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SENATOR ZITO:

In Senator Joyce's absence, I'd ask leave of the Body to handle these two remaining bills of his.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the request -- Senator Joyce is absent today, due to -- due to illness. Is there leave granted? Leave is granted. Senate -- House Bill 3658, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3675. Senator Rea. House Bill 3-6-7-5, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Public Health, Welfare and Corrections offers Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. The committee amendment -- this was a clarification -- the agency -- let me double-check here...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea's moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion?

SENATOR REA:

Good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3679, Madam Secretary. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3679.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:
Senator Barkhausen offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, this is a -- an amendment that is similar to one I offered on a Senate bill, dealing generally with the subject of uniform laws. The original bill in this case is again an additional Article 4A to the Commercial Code and the amendment is to add to this bill a Uniform Statutory Wills Act, and a Uniform Foreign Money Judgments Act. All of this, in one form or another, passed the Senate earlier, and I'm trying to put it back on a House bill. And I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Barkhausen's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3682. On the order of -- Senator Zito's been granted leave to handle that bill for Senator Joyce. 3682, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito.

SENATOR ZITO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members. The committee
offered one amendment that clarified the language of the legislation to insure that only pay phone operators and networks are exempted from the 9-1-1 surcharge, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Zito's moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3707.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3716. Senator DeAngelis. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill -- 3-7-1-6. 3-7-1-6.

SECRETARY HAWKER:
House Bill 3716.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator DeAngelis offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment takes out the Department of Revenue from the requirement, because they have in place a rather elaborate debt collection system. This is an amendment that everyone agrees with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Yes. The Department has -- has spoken to us about it also, Senator DeAngelis, and -- I think it does make sense for them not to be subject to the same oversight when they have their own contractual arrangements. So we agree with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there further discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3717. Senator Topinka. 3-3-7-1-7 <sic>, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:
House Bill 3717.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment is an Illinois State Chamber of Commerce amendment, is apparently agreed to. It defines "criterion."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Topinka offers Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

On this one? I'm not showing an -- an amendment. Could I have a copy of that?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

There is no amendment. I'm sorry. It was an error.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further amendments?

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

No further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3725. Hall. 3838. D'Arco. 3843. Fawell. On the Order of 2nd
Reading, House Bills 3-8-4-3, Madam Secretary. Read the bill,
please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3843.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Fawell offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. This was an amendment requested by the
Mayors and Managers Conference, and it merely exempts them from
the fees when the municipal police department has traffic tickets.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell has moved the adopted of Amendment No. 1. Is
there discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:
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Senator, as I understood this bill, this provided for a -- a jury demand fee of fifty dollars where the penalty is by fine only. Who are you trying to exempt out?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

This is for document storage systems. This is the -- this is the bill for the document -- yeah. It says the one-dollar to three-dollar fee if imposed by the DuPage County would -- would reduce by...okay?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Fawell has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3852. Senator DeAngelis. House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 3852, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3852.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senator DeAngelis, what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I have had some requests that have not been totally formulated
yet about putting some amendments on this since this -- this is the only township bill alive. I'm moving it to 3rd -- I will, in fact, accept amendments on Recall, but I would like for the -- whoever's interested to get them together all at one time. I don't want to be bringing it back and forth.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3853.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 32. 3856. Senator Jones. House Bill 3-8-5-6, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3856.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

You sure? 3rd Reading. 3875. Senator Holmberg. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3-8-7-5, Madam Secretary.
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SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3875.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Holmberg offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill requires notification of the next of kin before a permit for a disinterment can be issued. And under legal opinion, we needed to do some cleanup, and that's all that this amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Holmberg has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 3891, fiscal note. 3914. Senator Watson. 3940. On the Order of House Bills -- 2nd Reading is House Bill 3952. Senator -- 94, Senator Marovitz. 4-0-3-5. Rea. House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 4-0-3-5, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4035.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government offers Committee Amendment No. 1.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This here -- there was a mistake made in the drafting of the bill, and this straightens out the language and the intent. And would move for the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea's moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Committee Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further committee amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4159.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 4178. Senator Jones. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 4-1-7-8, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4178.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 4185. Senator Smith. 4185. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 4-1-8-5, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4185.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)


SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4221.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?
SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Rea offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This strikes the seventy-five percent and places in front of it a hundred percent, in terms of the cost of the loan program. And I would move for adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea's moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

SENATOR PHILIP:

Point of personal privilege. As you know, Senator MacDonald's husband is still in the hospital; I'd like the record to indicate that. Senator Mahar is still back home after his mother's funeral. And thirdly, Senator Dudycz is attending the first Flag Day parade and celebration in the City of Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

The minority leader in -- reminded me about the Flag Day speeches, and -- with his comment. And I was wondering -- this is the third printing, and they're moving real fast, and I'd like to get them off my desk. Flag Day speeches.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene has been staying up all night to write
those, and we're very appreciative. There goes another one.

Message from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 137

And it is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Executive. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1228 offered by Senator Jones.
Senate Resolution 1229 offered by Senator Mahar.
Senate Resolution 1230 offered by Senator Savickas.
Senate Resolution 1231 offered by Senator Savickas.
Senate Resolution 1232 offered by Senator Demuzio, President Rock and all Members.
Senate Resolution 1233 offered by Senator Topinka.
Senate Resolution 1234 offered by Senator Carroll.
And Senate Resolution 1235 offered by Senator Brookins.
And Senate Joint Resolution 201 offered by Senator Berman.

They're all congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 200 offered by Senators Hudson, Dudycz, Philip and President Rock.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hudson. Executive. All right. Senator Hudson, for
what purpose do you arise? Why don't you use — why don't you use
Senator Hawkinson's microphone? Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the — of
the Senate. I have just turned in a Senate Joint Resolution that
memorializes Congress to give Congress the power to prevent the
physical — desecration of our Flag. And we have a good many of
the Members, I think, almost all over here — and I would like as
many Members on the other side of the aisle — I have some — I
haven't had a chance to get them all. But any Members on the
other side of the aisle here that would like to go on this, as a
co-sponsor, they are certainly most welcome, and I would
appreciate them letting the clerk know that they would like to be
on this as co-sponsors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Thank you. The adjournment resolution, Madam
Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 199 offered by Senator Rock.

(Secretary reads SJR 199)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 199 is the adjournment
resolution. When we conclude our business very shortly here
today, it calls for us to return to Springfield next Tuesday, at
the hour of twelve o'clock noon, at which time we will begin on,
again, on the Order of 2nd Reading and handle all the
appropriation bills. So I would move for the suspension of the
rules and for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate
Joint Resolution 199.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 199. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Rock now moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 199. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate Joint Resolution 199 is adopted. 1st Reading of Bills.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1018 offered by Senator del Valle.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Rules Committee. Madam Secretary, have there been any objections filed to the Resolutions Consent Calendar?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

There have been no objections filed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, we will add to those that have been printed and passed out, Senate Resolutions 129 <sic> through and including 1-2-3-5. We will -- with leave of the Body we will add Senate Joint Resolution 201. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Holmberg moves the adoption of the Resolutions Consent Calendar. Is there discussion? All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Resolutions Consent Calendar is adopted. Further business to come before the Senate? You have anything else? All right. Senator Rock has moved that the Senate adjourn until next Tuesday. All right. June 19th, at the hour of noon. Senate stands adjourned.
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