103rd	Legislative	Day	May	8,	1996

PRESIDENT PHILIP:	17
The regular Session of the 89th General Assembly will please	19
come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and	20
will our guests in the galleries please rise. Our prayer today	21
will be given by Pastor Ted Gall, Immanuel Lutheran Church,	22
Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Gall.	
PASTOR TED GALL:	24
(Prayer by Pastor Ted Gall)	26
PRESIDENT PHILIP:	28
Will you please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance? Senator	30
Raica will lead us in the Pledge.	32
SENATOR RAICA:	34
(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Raica)	36
PRESIDENT PHILIP:	38
We had a request from James Nelson and Peter Sturgis to	40
videotape today. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Reading of	41
the Journal. Senator Butler.	
SENATOR BUTLER:	43
Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the	45
Journals of Wednesday, May 1st; Thursday, May 2nd; and Tuesday,	46
May 7th, in the year 1996, be postponed, pending arrival of the	48
printed Journal.	
PRESIDENT PHILIP:	50
Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and the approval	52
of the Journals, pending the arrival of the printed transcript.	54
There being no objection, so ordered. Committee Reports.	55
SECRETARY HARRY:	57
Senator Rauschenberger, Chair of the Committee on	59
Appropriations, reports House Bills 2751, 3694, 3695, 3696 and	61
3698 Do Pass.	
Senator Hawkinson, Chair of the Committee on Judiciary,	63
reports Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 548 Be Adopted; Amendment	65

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
4 to House Bill 1249, Amendment 1 to House Bill 2621, Amendment 3	67
to House Bill 3451 and Amendment 2 to House Bill 3617 all Be	
Adopted.	68
Senator Karpiel, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports	70
Senate Bill 1783 - the Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 Be	72
Adopted; House Joint Resolution 106 Be Adopted; and Senate Joint	73
Resolution 92 Be Adopted, as Amended.	
PRESIDENT PHILIP:	75
have your attention, please. I'm going to turn the Podium	77
over to Senator Fawell, for the purpose of an introduction.	78
Senator Fawell.	
SENATOR FAWELL:	80
Thank you very much. I think this is an introduction you all	82
would be interested in. This is a constituent of mine, Tracy	83
Hayes, who is Miss Illinois, and she is a senior in	84
specializing in media communications at Wheaton College. Tracy	85
was the fourth runner-up of the Miss America Pageant last	86
September, and she has spent this year advocating her platform	87
issue, which is juvenile crime prevention. This past week Tracy	
has been on a school tour in southern Illinois, speaking to	88
students about the importance of education, college and setting	89
career goals. Please welcome Miss Illinois 1995, my constituent,	90
Tracy Hayes.	
MISS TRACY HAYES:	92
(Remarks by Miss Tracy Hayes, Miss Illinois 1995)	95
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	97
Messages from the House.	99
SECRETARY HARRY:	101
Message from the House by Mr. McLennand, Clerk.	103
Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that	105
the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the	106

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

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senate Bill 1673, with House Amendment No. 1.	109
We have like Messages on Senate Bill 681, with House Amendment	111
1; Senate Bill 1342, with Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1381, with	112
Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1414, with Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1470,	113
with Amendment 2; Senate Bill 1513, with Amendment 1; and Senate	
Bill 1543, with Amendment 1.	114
All passed the House, as amended, May 7th, 1996.	116
Message from the House by Mr. McLennand, Clerk.	118
Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that	120
the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint	121
resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the	122
concurrence of the Senate, to wit:	
House Joint Resolution 102.	124
Adopted by the House, May 7th, 1996.	126
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	128
Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?	130
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:	132
Madam President, a point of personal privilege.	134
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	136
Please state your point.	138
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:	140
Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm	142
delighted that I have three of my constituents here today; namely,	144
Priscilla Humay - H-U-M-A-Y - Duffy - D-U-F-F-Y from Gurnee;	146
Christine Walsh Angelos - A-N-G-E-L-O-S - of Gurnee; and Debrah	147
Lewis, from Zion, Illinois. I'm delighted to have them here and	148
would like you to to have us welcome them here.	150
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	152
Will you please rise and be recognized. Welcome by the Senate.	154
Resolutions.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	15
Senate Resolution 205, offered by Senator Trotter.	158

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
It's substantive, Madam President.	159
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	161
On the bottom of page 7 is the Order of 2nd House Bills 2nd	163
Reading. We will be going there immediately. First up will be	164
Senator Madigan, Senator O'Malley, Senator Cronin. On the bottom	166
of page 7. Senator Madigan, on House Bill 322. Out of the	167
record. Senator O'Malley, on House Bill 431. Senator O'Malley?	168
Out of the record. Senator Cronin. Roll read the bill, Mr.	170
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	172
House Bill 545.	174
(Secretary reads title of bill)	176
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted	178
Amendment No. 1.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	180
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	182
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	184
No further amendments reported.	186
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	188
3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 548. Read the	190
bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	192
House Bill 548.	194
(Secretary reads title of bill)	196
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.	198
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	200
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	202

consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

204

206

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Cronin, on Amendment No. 1.	211
SENATOR CRONIN:	213
Hi. Thank you, Madam President. The bill restricts the	215
requirement for GED classes to a specific class of criminals in	216
DOC. It isn't as broad-sweeping as it was before. It has the	217
support of Department of Corrections, and I ask for your favorable	218
consideration.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	220
Is there any discussion? Senator del Valle.	222
SENATOR dEL VALLE:	224
Thank you, Madam President. Senator Cronin, you just	226
indicated that you've amended the part of the bill regarding the	228
GED class requirement, to limit it to a smaller group. How how	229
large of a group are we talking about now? How many individuals	230
currently would fall into this category?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	232
Senator Cronin.	234
SENATOR CRONIN:	236
We've restricted it to about two hundred current inmates, or	238
residents, of DOC. Previously it was all those that would be	239
given a sentence of probation, supervision. So that would have	240
been a much larger population. We're we're fulfilling the	242
the intent, but we're trying to do it in a more financially	
feasible way.	243
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	245
Senator del Valle.	247
SENATOR dEL VALLE:	249
Well, we'll we'll talk more about it when the bill is on	251
3rd Reading, but I'd like to know the number of individuals that	252
would have been affected if we hadn't amended the bill, so that we	253
can debate it on 3rd Reading.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	255

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Further discussion? Senator Shaw. Further discussion?	257
Further discussion? Senator Cronin, to close.	
SENATOR CRONIN:	259
I just ask for your favorable consideration. Look forward to	261
the debate on 3rd Reading.	262
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	264
. Senator Cronin moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House	266
Bill 548. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes	268
have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there further	269
amendments approved for consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	271
No further amendments reported.	273
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	275
3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 885. Just a	277
second, Senator Cronin. We're going to go back with leave,	279
we're going back to pick up Senator O'Malley and move his bill to	281
the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator O'Malley, on House Bill 431.	
Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	282
SECRETARY HARRY:	284
House Bill 431.	286
(Secretary reads title of bill)	288
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Revenue adopted	290
Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 5.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	292
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	294
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	296
No further amendments reported.	298
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	300
3rd Reading. Now, Senator Cronin, on House Bill 885. Read	302
the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	304

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996

House Bill 885.	306
(Secretary reads title of bill)	308
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	310
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	312
3rd Reading. Senator Philip, on House Bill 2206. Senator	314
Philip, on House Bill 2206? Senator Philip? Want to roll it?	316
Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	318
House Bill 2206.	320
(Secretary reads title of bill)	322
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive adopted	324
Amendment No. 1.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	326
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	328
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	330
No further amendments reported.	332
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	334
3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 2230. Read the	336
bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	338
House Bill 2230.	340
(Secretary reads title of bill)	342
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted	344
Amendment No. 1.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	346
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	348
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	350
No further amendments reported.	352
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	354
3rd Reading. Senator Weaver, on House Bill 2515. Out of the	356

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
record. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 2593. Read the bill, Mr.	
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	358
House Bill 2593.	360
(Secretary reads title of bill)	362
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	364
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	366
3rd Reading. Senator Klemm, on House Bill 2695. Read the	368
bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	370
House Bill 2695.	372
(Secretary reads title of bill)	374
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	376
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	378
3rd Reading. Senator Woodyard, on House Bill 2703. Senator	381
Woodyard? House Bill Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	383
House Bill 2703.	385
(Secretary reads title of bill)	387
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	389
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	391
3rd Reading. Senator Walsh, on House Bill 2794. Read the	393
bill, Mr. Secretary.	394
SECRETARY HARRY:	396
House Bill 2794.	398
(Secretary reads title of bill)	400
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	402
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	404
3rd Reading. Senator Walsh, on 2860. Read the bill, Mr.	406
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	408
House Bill 2860.	410

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996

(Secretary reads title of bill)	412
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	414
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	416
3rd Reading. Senator Madigan, on House Bill 2927. Out of the	418
record. Senator Klemm, on House Bill 3041. Read the bill, Mr.	
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	420
House Bill 3041.	422
(Secretary reads title of bill)	424
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government and	426
Elections adopted Amendment No. 1.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	428
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	430
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	432
No further amendments reported.	434
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	436
3rd Reading. Senator Dillard, on House Bill 3048. Read the	438
bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	440
House Bill 3048.	442
(Secretary reads title of bill)	444
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted	446
Amendment No. 1.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	448
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for	450
consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	452
No further amendments reported.	454
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	456
3rd Reading. Senator Butler, on House Bill 3128. Out of the	458
record. Senator Walsh, on House Bill 3166. Read the bill, Mr.	459

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	461
House Bill 3166.	463
(Secretary reads title of bill)	465
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	467
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	469
3rd Reading. Senator Maitland, on House Bill 3167. Read the	471
bill, Mr. Secretary.	472
SECRETARY HARRY:	474
House Bill 3167.	476
(Secretary reads title of bill)	478
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.	480
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	482
3rd Reading. Senator Dudycz, on House Bill 3349. Out of the	484
record. Senator Philip, on House Bill 3380. Senator Philip, on	486
House Bill 3380the record. Senator Parker, on House Bill	
3426. Out of the record. Senator Klemm, on House Bill 3436.	487
Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	488
SECRETARY HARRY:	490
House Bill 3436.	492
(Secretary reads title of bill)	494
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted	496

Amendments 1 and 2. 497 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 499 Have there been any Floor amendments approved for 501 consideration? 503 SECRETARY HARRY: 505 No further amendments reported. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 507 509 3rd Reading. Senator Parker, on House Bill -- 3520. House Bill 3520. Out of the record. Senator Mahar, on Senate -- House 510 Bill - sorry - House Bill 3548. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

103rd Legislative Day	May 8, 1996	
SECRETARY HARRY:		512
House Bill 3548.		514
(Secretary reads title of bill)		516
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendm	ents.	518
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)		520
3rd Reading. Senator Sieben, on House Bill 365	8. Read the	522
bill, Mr. Secretary.		
SECRETARY HARRY:		524
House Bill 3658.		526
(Secretary reads title of bill)		528
2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendm	ents.	530
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)		532
3rd Reading. Senator Dillard, on House Bill 3662.	Read the	534
bill, Mr. Secretary.		535
SECRETARY HARRY:		537
House Bill 3662.		539
(Secretary reads title of bill)		541
2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Stat	e Government	543
Operations adopted Amendment No. 1.		544
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)		546
Have there been any Floor amendments ap	proved for	548
consideration?		
SECRETARY HARRY:		550
No further amendments reported.		552
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)		554
3rd Reading. Senator Woodyard, for what purpose	do you seek	556
recognition?		
SENATOR WOODYARD:		558
Yes, thank you, Madam President. For the pur	pose of an	560
announcement. I want the record to show that Senato	r Madigan is	561
absent today due to illness.	•	

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

The record will so reflect. Now, the intent of the Chair is to	565
go to House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bills 3rd Reading. It's on	567
the middle of page 3 on your CalendarRauschenberger, Senator	569
Karpiel, Senator Dudycz, first up. House Bills 3rd Reading.	570
Senator Woodyard, your light's still on. You want to take your	571
light off? Thank you. On the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill	572
22. Senator Rauschenberger. House Bill 22. Out of the record.	573
Senator Karpiel. Senator Karpiel, on House Bill 24. Out of the	574
record. Senator Dudycz, on House Bill 1115 (sic). Senator	575
Dudycz, on 115. Senator Hawkinson, on House Bill 346. Read the	576
bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	578
House Bill 346.	580
(Secretary reads title of bill)	582
3rd Reading of the bill.	584
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	586
Senator Hawkinson.	588
SENATOR HAWKINSON:	590
Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 346, unamended in the	592
Senate, creates a new classification of public employees -	593
courthouse security personnel. Because of an Attorney General's	595
opinion, we're finding that about twenty-five of our counties,	596
unless we pass this law, would no longer be able to use the	
security personnel, the jail personnel, that they use for	597
security personnel, the jail personnel, that they use for courthouse security, transferring and and watching prisoners	597 598
courthouse security, transferring and and watching prisoners	598
courthouse security, transferring and and watching prisoners during their pending court appearances and the like. And this	598 599
courthouse security, transferring and and watching prisoners during their pending court appearances and the like. And this bill will allow those employees to continue to do what they've	598 599 600

weapons exception for these employees, as well as other correctional officers. In addition, on another subject matter,

603

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

the bill allows a plaintiff in an administrative review action to	605
obtain service on the agency if they have already served the	606
agency head or to refile against an employee acting in his	
official capacity if they have already served the agency. Without	607
this change, we're finding them some cases are being dismissed	608
because all necessary parties have not been named and served. And	609
finally, it amends the court services fee to permit the county	611
board to assess the fee for traffic, conservation, and ordinance	612
cases in which defendants do not appear in court but only pay the	
fine. I'd be happy to try and answer any questions. Passed out	613
of committee on the Agreed Bill List and passed unanimously in the	614
House.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	616
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing	619
none, the question is, shall House Bill 346 pass. Those in favor	
will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted	621
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?	622
Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays,	624
none voting Present. House Bill 346, having received the required	625
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator	
Rauschenberger, on House Bill 456. Out of the record. Senator	626
DeAngelis, on House Bill 527. Senator DeAngelis? Out of the	628
record. Senator Hawkinson, on House Bill 739. Read the bill, Mr.	
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	630
House Bill 739.	632

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam... No, I want to pass this bill. Sorry.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

634 636

638

640

642

103rd Legislative Day

SECRETARY HARRY:

May 8, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	646
Out of the record. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 995. Out of	648
the record. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 999. Out of the	
record. Senator Bomke, on House Bill 1056. Read the bill, Mr.	649
Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	651
House Bill 1056.	653
(Secretary reads title of bill)	655
3rd Reading of the bill.	657
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	659
Senator Bomke.	661
SENATOR BOMKE:	663
Thank you, Madam President. This bill is identical to Senate	665
Bill 1811 that we passed about a month ago, and it simply defines	666
the boundaries between public-owned utilities and investor-owned	667
utilities.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	669
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the	671
question is, shall House Bill 1056 pass. Those in favor will vote	672
Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?	673
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the	674
record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting	675
Present. House Bill 1056, having received the required	676
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hawkinson,	677
do you wish to return House Bill 1249 to the Order of 2nd Reading	679
for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Hawkinson seeks leave	681
of the Body to return House Bill 1249 to the Order of 2nd Reading	
for the purposes of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is	683
granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1249. Mr.	684
Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for	685
consideration?	

House Bill 1290.

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Hawkinson.	690
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	692
Senator Hawkinson, on Amendment No. 4.	694
SENATOR HAWKINSON:	696
Thank you, Madam President. This amendment was approved on	698
our Agreed Bill List this morning, recommended Be Approved for	699
Consideration in Judiciary Committee. It does two things. First,	700
it reconciles the technical differences between two earlier	702
amendments dealing with the topic of psychotropic medication and	
appeals, and it also sets up a procedure to address the backlog of	703
cases that the Appellate Defender has. And this would allow the	704
Appellate Defender to bid these cases on a competitive basis to	705
private counsel up to a rate of forty dollars an hour with a	706
maximum of two thousand dollars. The bidding would be done through	707
the Office of the Appellate Defender and is needed to address a	
tremendous backlog of cases. I would ask for the adoption of	708
Amendment No. 4.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	710
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, all	712
those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the	713
amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments approved	714
for consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	716
No further amendments reported, Madam President.	718
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	720
3rd Reading. Senator Luechtefeld, on House Bill 1645. Read	722
the bill, Mr. Secretaryof the record. I skipped a bill	723
here. I apologize. House Bill 1290. Senator Burzynski. Read	724
the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	726

(Secretary reads title of bill)

728 730

May 8, 1996

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
3rd Reading of the bill.	732
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	734
Senator Burzynski.	736
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	738
Thank you, Madam President. This repeals the Article creating	740
the Office of Public Counsel. Basically, we've not funded the	741
Office of Public Counsel since 1994, and their oversight	742
procedures are already being done by the Commerce Commission and	743
the Attorney General.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	745
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the	747
question is Senator Palmer, do you seek recognition?	748
SENATOR PALMER:	750
Thank you, Madam President. A question of the sponsor.	752
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	754
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.	756
SENATOR PALMER:	758
Senator, why is CUB opposed to this legislation?	760
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	762
Senator Burzynski.	764
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	766
You know, to be quite honest, I don't know, because they have	768
not come to speak to me about it.	769
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	771
Senator Palmer.	773
SENATOR PALMER:	775
What is the legislative intent of this piece of legislation?	777
Does it affect rates, or public access, or oversight at all?	778
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	780
Senator Burzynski.	782
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	784

There is $\operatorname{--}$ there is no provision within this bill that would

103rd Legislative Day

SENATOR WELCH:

May 8, 1996

affect rates or the rate-making process at all, as far as I know. 787 As I've already indicated, oversight does exist relative to the 788 Commerce Commission and the Attorney General's Office because they 789 each have their consumer services division. So, I don't believe 790 that -- that there's anything there except a duplication of 791 services, and also, there's an agency that we haven't funded since 792 1994.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

794 796

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Welch.

798 800

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812 813

814

815

816

817

818

819

Madam President. This is a bill that is going to Thank you, eliminate the only office that exists that protects consumers I think that covers about everybody in the utility services. To vote to eliminate the Office of Public Counsel vote to take away one of the protections we have against increases Illinois Commerce Commission for these utility companies. To be recorded Aye on this bill would be to say that you don't that consumers should be protected, because right now they are not being protected by any government-funded agency before the Commerce Commission. And it seems to me that utility rates They keep going up. This is definitely a bill going down. that will be portrayed in the future as one that was against So, I know consumers don't have a lot of impact down consumers. here, they don't have a lot of pull, but there's also businesses that pay for utilities, there's also corporations that pay utility Everybody pays utility bills. We're not even funding bills. this. What -- what is the point of eliminating it? us any money. Let's leave it on the books, and when it comes to the point where we need to fund it and get it Just to eliminate it for no particular can do so. reason doesn't help clean up the Statute books very much. It's

waste of effort to do so, and it's a slap in the face of the

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
consuming public and the voters to do that. I would urge a No	
vote.	820
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	822
Further discussion? Senator Hendon.	824
SENATOR HENDON:	826
Thank you very much, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield	828
for a question?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	830
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.	832
SENATOR HENDON:	834
Senator, why Well, let me let me rephrase that. Don't	836
you feel that if you had a case, yourself, wouldn't you want an	837
independent attorney to represent you separate from the person	838
that has to make the decision?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	840
Senator Burzynski.	842
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	844
Well, I think that there are safeguards in place to do some of	846
that, Senator.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	848
Senator Hendon.	850
SENATOR HENDON:	852
My question is, my dear friend: If you, personally, were going	854
to court, wouldn't you want an attorney that is separate from the	855
judge or the jury that's going to make the decision in your case?	856
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	858
Senator Burzynski.	860
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	862
Well, as has just been pointed out to me and as I pointed out	864
earlier as well, the Attorney General does have a consumer	865

services division which would act in that capacity, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

866

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Hendon.	871
SENATOR HENDON:	873
Now, while while we have an outstanding Attorney General,	875
and I have no problems with him whatsoever, he is busy. The	876
Attorney General's Office has a large area of responsibility.	877
This particular office is there just to as I understand and I	878
read it, to protect the public, to give the average citizen from	879
any of our district a representative, a person with legal	
knowledge, to help them in a case where they have a problem with	880
the utilities. Why would we eliminate the only independent office	881
that we have right now when We haven't funded it. So it's not	883
like it's bankrupting the State or anything like this. Is this	884
office causing a strain on the on the fiscal stability of the	
State of Illinois?	885
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	887
Senator Burzynski.	889
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	891
Not at all, Senator.	893
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	895
Senator Hendon.	897
SENATOR HENDON:	899
Well, I'll close by saying, since it's not causing any	901
financial problems for the State, since it is the only independent	902
office that protects the consumer, I would urge a No vote on this	903
bill, because it's a it's clearly a bad bill, an anticonsumer	904
bill, and we should not be in the business here in this Senate of	905
doing such a thing.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	907
Further discussion? Senator Fawell.	909
SENATOR FAWELL:	911
Will the sponsor yield for a question?	913
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	915

May 8, 1996 103rd Legislative Day 915 Indicates he'll yield, Senator Fawell. 917 SENATOR FAWELL: According to our analysis, the Commerce Commission and the 919 Attorney General each have a consumer service division. Is that 920 true? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 922 924 Senator Burzynski. 926 SENATOR BURZYNSKI: That's true, as well as CUB also fights many of these rate 928 cases. 930 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 932 Senator Fawell. 934 SENATOR FAWELL: So you've got several attorneys, actually, that can be tapped 936 937 into. Is that true? 939 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) Senator Burzynski. 941 943 SENATOR BURZYNSKI: 945 That is correct. 947 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 949 Senator Fawell. SENATOR FAWELL: 951 Well, to the bill: If we've got all these attorneys running 953 around doing this work, I don't know why we need to add another 954 955 one to the pile. I think this is a good bill. It's long overdue, 956 and I think we all ought to be on board. 958 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) Further discussion? Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator 960 961 Burzynski, to close. 963 SENATOR BURZYNSKI: 965 I think the merits of the legislation have been thoroughly

discussed. I would simply indicate that we don't need another

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
agency to duplicate services, and I would ask for a favorable roll	967
call.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	969
The question is, shall House Bill 1290 pass. Those in favor	971
will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted	972
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have	
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.	
On that question, there are 19 Ayes, 36 Nays, none voting Present.	973
House Bill 1290, having not received the required constitutional	974
majority, is declared failed. Senator Luechtefeld, on House Bill	975
1645. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	977
House Bill 1645.	979
(Secretary reads title of bill)	981
3rd Reading of the bill.	983
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	985
Senator Luechtefeld.	987
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	989
Madam President and Members of the of the Senate, House	991
Bill 1645 provides that the homestead improvement exemption also	992
applies to rebuilding of residential structures on homestead	993
property following a catastrophic event. Under current law, a	994
homestead improvement exemption of up to thirty thousand dollars	
per year may be taken if a proposed increase in assessed valuation	995
is attributable solely to the new improvement of the existing	996
structure. I would ask for a favorable vote on this issue.	997
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	999
Is there any discussion? Senator Palmer.	1001
SENATOR PALMER:	1003
Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.	1005
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1007

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

SENATOR PALMER:	1011
Senator, was as I recall, was there not an understanding in	1013
the Revenue Committee that you would work with the Cook County	1014
Assessor's Office to straighten out the administrative and	1015
logistical problems that that Office has with your bill?	1017
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1019
Senator Luechtefeld.	1021
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1023
Yes, Senator, there was, and we have really worked at that,	1025
you know, with a couple of other Senators on the other side of the	1026
aisle, plus with the with the group from Cook County, and we	1027
were not able to come up with any language that would be suitable	1028
to our side.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1030
Senator Palmer.	1032
SENATOR PALMER:	1034
Well, Senator, given that there are still some very serious	1036
concerns, I think that it would be appropriate to take this bill	1037
out for right now and not act on it. As I understand, there were	1038
several options offered to speak to the concerns, and for example,	1039
there was one offering to establish a separate Section for Cook	1040
County only that was not acceptable and I'd like to know why. And	1041
for those on this side of the aisle, so that you understand what	
we're talking about, there's no opposition to what Senator	1042
Luechtefeld is trying to do. The question here is how the	1043
exemption can be administered fairly and uniformly, and how the	1044
information about the loss of a home can be communicated to the	1045
Cook County Assessor in such a way that we will know that, in	
fact, the home has been destroyed. And I'm not sure why this	1046
should be a problem in working this out.	1047
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1049

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

Thank you, Madam President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1055 Senate, Senator Luechtefeld and myself and others have tried to 1056

103rd Legislative Day

SENATOR BERMAN:

May 8, 1996

put together language that has been requested by the Assessor of	1057
Cook County. As you are very well aware, when we have this kind	1059
of a bill, as it impacts or could impact in Cook County, we're	
talking about a potential monstrous-type of paperwork undertaking.	1060
As we speak, the Assessor's staff is preparing a suggested	1061
amendment to this bill. This bill has not been amended in the	1062
Senate. We have no problems with the purpose of the bill, but the	1063
Assessor's Office does have a problem with how it can be processed	1064
in Cook County and and requirements for the taxpayer to provide	1065
certain proof of the catastrophe that gave rise to the destruction	
to allow this exemption to take place. So I want to renew the	1066
request of Senator Palmer to the sponsor. Take this out of the	1067
record today. We will have an amendment for you that does not	1068
attack the purpose of the bill. It just makes it workable in Cook	1069
County, and we can get the amendment adopted and move this bill	1070
probably tomorrow or certainly by Tuesday. And we are not bumping	
up against any deadline, but it'll make it workable in Cook.	1071
Otherwise, we've got ourselves a real headache as to how it's	1072
going to be processed. So, Senator, I $\operatorname{}$ I would respectfully ask	1073
that it be taken out of the record.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1075
Further discussion? Senator Peterson.	1077
SENATOR PETERSON:	1079
Question of the sponsor.	1081
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1083
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Peterson.	1085
SENATOR PETERSON:	1087
Senator Luechtefeld, are any other county assessors or any	1090
other supervisor of assessments, have they contacted you in	

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
opposition to this bill?	1091
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1093
Senator Luechtefeld.	1095
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1097
No, they have not.	1099
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1101
Senator Peterson.	1103
SENATOR PETERSON:	1105
So we only have Cook County, and all the other hundred and one	1107
counties $% \left(\left(1\right) \right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) $ feel that they can handle this legislation without any	1108
problem.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1110
Senator Luechtefeld.	1112
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1114
Well, I I certainly have not checked with all the other	1116
hundred and one counties, but and I do understand that ${\tt Cook}$	1117
County, with the massive amount of $\operatorname{}$ of people that they have, it	1118
becomes more difficult. But this particular $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	1119
present law. And that $$ you know, they have a procedure in place	1121
at the present time to deal with the exemptions, and I think this	
this will simply handle that.	1122
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1124
Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis. Out of the record	1126
or, I mean I'm sorry, Senator Luechtefeld. Is there any	1128
further discussion? Senator Hendon.	
SENATOR HENDON:	1130
Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for	1132
question?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1134
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.	1136
SENATOR HENDON:	1138
Senator Luechtefeld, this is just gives a person the	1140

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
opportunity - and correct me if I'm wrong - who has lost their	1141
home because of a catastrophe to have an opportunity to rebuild	1142
that that home without the burden of the taxes being put on	1143
those people at that time. Is that correct?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1149
Senator Luechtefeld.	1147
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1149
Yes, Senator.	115
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1153
Senator Hendon.	1159
SENATOR HENDON:	1157
And even though the Assessor from Cook County is opposed to	1159
this, there are already laws on the books that will take care of	1160
someone who commits fraud in trying to collect the claim that they	116
really don't have coming. Is that correct?	1162
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1164
Senator Luechtefeld.	1166
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1168
Yes, Senator.	1170
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1172
Senator Hendon.	1174
SENATOR HENDON:	1176
Well, in conclusion, I just say to all of my colleagues that	1178
this is a good bill. It's a progressive bill. We should give the	1179
taxpayers of this State relief any time they have a catastrophe or	1186
a disaster like this, and I can't understand why there is any	118
opposition. And I urge an Aye vote.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1183
Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.	118
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:	118

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

1189

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Geo-Karis.	1193
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:	1195
Do I understand that your bill provides that the homestead	1197
improvement exemption would apply to rebuilding of residential	1198
structures on homestead property following a catastrophic event?	1199
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1201
Senator Luechtefeld.	1203
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1205
It only applies to homestead and property.	1207
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1209
Senator Geo-Karis.	1211
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:	1213
Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, my	1215
area was hit by a tornado. There were many people whose homes	1216
were absolutely riddled down; that was their homestead. I think	1217
this is a very good bill, and I certainly think we should provide	1218
for emergencies like that and I support this bill wholeheartedly.	1219
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1221
Further discussion? Senator Welch.	1223
SENATOR WELCH:	1225
I have a question of the sponsor.	1227
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1229
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.	1231
SENATOR WELCH:	1233
Senator Luechtefeld, if I own a hundred-thousand-dollar home	1235
and it gets hit by a tornado, and I rebuild it with a	1236
hundred-thousand-dollar home and my assessment is the same, do I	1237
get any benefit at all from this law?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1239
Senator Luechtefeld.	1241
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1243

No, you do not. Only if -- only if you increase it to -- 1245

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
thirty thousand. You'll have a thirty-thousand-dollar extra	1246
exemption.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1248
Senator Welch.	1250
SENATOR WELCH:	1252
So so these areas that have homes destroyed by tornadoes or	1255
whatever, if they rebuild, because of the zoning requirement, a	1256
similar square-foot house, a similar size, more than likely it's	1257
going to be assessed the same value as the one that was knocked	
down; it's only newer. Isn't that correct?	1258
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1,260
Senator Luechtefeld.	1262
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1264
I understand that's correct, yes.	1266
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1268
Further discussion? Senator Welch.	1270
SENATOR WELCH:	1272
Well, then, I don't think this bill does any harm to anybody.	1274
I I would urge an Aye vote.	1275
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1277
Any discussion? Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator	1279
Luechtefeld, to close.	1280
SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:	1282
Yes. I would ask for a favorable vote on this issue.	1284
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1286
Question is, shall House Bill 1645 pass. Those in favor will	1288
vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who	1290
wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have	
all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are	
48 Ayes, 1 Nay, 2 voting Present. House Bill 1645, having	1291
received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.	

Senator Cronin, on House Bill 1684. Senator Cronin? Out of the

103rd Legislative Day

3rd Reading of the bill.

Senator DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

record. Senator Burzynski, on House Bill 1798. Read the bill,	
Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	1294
House Bill 1798.	1296
(Secretary reads title of bill)	1298
3rd Reading of the bill.	1300
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1302
Senator Burzynski.	1304
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	1306
Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the	1308
Senate. Basically, this deletes language in the Illinois	1310
Pesticide Act which provides for a model program and replaces it	1311
by implementing a statewide voluntary program for the collection	1312
and proper disposal of unwanted ag pesticides from Illinois	
farmers. I know of no opposition to this bill.	1313
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1315
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the	1317
question is, shall House Bill 1798 pass. Those in favor will vote	1318
Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?	1319
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the	1320
record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting	1321
Present. House Bill 1798, having received the required	1322
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Walsh, on	
House Bill 2250. Out of the record. Senator Mahar, on House Bill	1323
2294. Senator Cronin, on House Bill 2338. Out of the record.	
Senator DeLeo, on House Bill 2516. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	1325
House Bill 2516.	1327
(Secretary reads title of bill)	1329

1331

1333

1335

May 8, 1996

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

SENATOR DeLEO:	1337
Thank you, Madam President, Members of the General Assembly.	1339
2516 is a bill that simply states that in Chicago if a landlord is	1341
determined to have violated a provision establishing construction	
or maintenance standards of a building containing rental housing	1342
units, the court may offer the owner an option: instead of a	1343
fine, attending a program designated to encourage the owner's	1344
compliance. The thrust of this bill is to permit Chicago to offer	1345
landlords compliance programs for persons who offer sleeping	1346
rooms. As you know, we had a tragic fire in Chicago last year	
with a SRO - a sleeping room only - occupancy building, and there	1347
was many deaths and many injuries. This would have landlords go	1348
to a program that would explain to them construction, plumbing,	1349
heating, fire prevention, sanitation and other safety violations	1350
in this class, instead of levying a fine. I'd ask for a favorable	1351
roll call on 2516.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1353
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing	1355
none, the question is, shall House Bill 2516 pass. Those in favor	1356
will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted	1358
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?	
Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 1 Nay, none	1359
voting Present. House Bill 2516, having received the required	1360
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Bomke, on	1361
House Bill 2524. Senator Hawkinson, on House Bill 2529. Read the	1362
bill, Mr. Secretary. Out of the record. Senator Rauschenberger,	1363
on House Bill 2571. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	1364
SECRETARY HARRY:	1366
House Bill 2571.	1368
(Secretary reads title of bill)	1370
3rd Reading of the bill.	1372
DESCRIPTING OPERCED. (CENAROD DONAULE)	1374

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Rauschenberger.	1376
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	1378
Thank you, Mr. {sic} President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the	1380
Senate. House Bill 2571 cures a defect that the courts found in	1383
the ICC's authority to allow utilities to enter into bilateral	1384
contracts. It's a bill that I think is going to have a major	1385
impact on continuing the effort toward deregulation of the	
electric utilities. It's a bill that passed out of committee with	1386
bipartisan support. I urge its favorable adoption.	1387
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1389
Is there any discussion? Senator Palmer.	1391
SENATOR PALMER:	1393
Thank you, Madam President. A question of the sponsor.	1395
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1397
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.	1399
SENATOR PALMER:	1401
Senator, I wish I shared your optimism about this, but you and	1403
I talked before, and isn't it a fact that the current utility	1404
bills are the highest in this region, if not in the country,	1405
already?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1407
Senator Rauschenberger.	1409
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	1411
Illinois residents of northern Illinois that are served by	1413
Commonwealth Edison pay, I think, the second-highest large utility	1414
rate in the nation.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1416
Senator Palmer.	1418
SENATOR PALMER:	1420
And isn't it also a fact that part of the reason for that is	1422
for decisions that were made twenty years ago about building	1424

nuclear plants that they were advised not to build and therefore 1425

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 199	96
that increase has been passed down to the consumer?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1427
Senator Rauschenberger.	1429
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	1431
Senator Palmer, I think many people would agree tha	at 1433
Commonwealth Edison overconstructed capacity, and it is very, ver	ry 1434
true that that excess capacity, that's clear today, is being pai	id 1435
for by the ratepayers. You're to to the best of m	my 1437
knowledge, you're correct.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1439
Senator Palmer.	1441
SENATOR PALMER:	1443
Last question: Will this bill, in any way, alleviate the high	gh 1445
rates for residential and for small business consumers of	of 1446
electricity? Will it do anything to work on their behalf?	1447
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1449
Senator Rauschenberger.	1451
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	1453
Senator, the bill itself would not change the rates that	at 1455
consumers or small businesses or anyone else pays on a curren	nt 1456
rate structure. What I think it does do, though, is it helps mov	ve 1457
Commonwealth Edison and our other utilities the next step that	's 1458
necessary for the deregulation task force to help prepare them for	or 1459
deregulation of the entire industry and lower rates for everyone	е,
I think, by the year 2000.	1460
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1462
Further discussion? Senator Clayborne.	1464
	1466

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. 1468
Being from downstate and trying to further encourage economic 1469
development, I believe this bill goes a long way to that effort to 1470
allow utilities to be competitive and to make sure that the costs 1471

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

are not passed on to the consumer. This is a bill that will	
hopefully help continue to bring business interests to downstate	1472
so that we can provide job opportunities and growth for the	1473
residents in in southern Illinois. I urge a favorable vote on	1474
this bill.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1476
Is there any further discussion? Further discussion? Seeing	1478
none, Senator Rauschenberger, to close.	1479
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	1481
I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.	1483
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1485
The question is, shall House Bill 2571 pass. Those in favor	1487
will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted	1488
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?	
Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,	
there are 43 Ayes, 11 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 2571,	1489
having received the required constitutional majority, is declared	
passed. Senator Watson, on House Bill 2596. Out of the record.	1490
Senator Maitland, on House Bill 2616. Out of the record. Senator	
Hawkinson. Senator Hawkinson seeks leave of the Body to return	1491
House Bill 2621 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purposes of an	1492
amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order	1493
of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2621. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?	1494
SECRETARY HARRY:	1496
Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Hawkinson.	1498
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1500

Thank you, Madam President. Amendment No. 1 was approved for 1506 consideration by the Judiciary Committee this morning on the -- 1507 the Agreed List. What it does is it removes Section 7 of the bill 1508

Senator Hawkinson, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

1502

SENATE TRANSCRIPT	
103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996	
{sic} (Act) which provides additional civil penalties for	
violations of the Counterfeit Trademark Act. It was felt by the	1510
Bar Association, and I think agreed by the House sponsor, that	1511
these civil penalties already exist in the Deceptive Act $\{\operatorname{\text{\rm sic}}\}$ and	1512
in the Consumer Fraud Act, and that we did not need to create a	1513
separate civil penalty Act in this new Counterfeit Trademark Act.	
So, we would ask for the approval of Floor Amendment No. 1, which	1514
removes Section 7 from the bill {sic}.	1516
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1518
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, all	1520
those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the	15,21
amendment is adopted. Are there further Floor amendments approved	1522
for consideration?	
SECRETARY HARRY:	1524
No further amendments reported.	1526
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1528
3rd Reading. Senator Hawkinson, on House Bill 2651. Out of	1530
the record. Senator Karpiel, on House Bill 2664. Out of the	
record. Senator Syverson, on House Bill 2691. Out of the record.	1531
Senator Parker, on House Bill 2697. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	
SECRETARY HARRY:	1533
House Bill 2697.	1535
(Secretary reads title of bill)	1537
3rd Reading of the bill:	1539
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1541
Senator Parker.	1543
	4 -

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1547 Senate. House Bill 2697 amends the Illinois Credit Union Act 1549 {sic}. It does three things. It increases the penalty from a 1551 Class A misdemeanor to a Class 3 felony for engaging in the business of transmitting money without a license. It gives DFI 1552

SENATOR PARKER:

the power to issue a cease and desist order without an 1553 administrative hearing to a firm which DFI believes to be engaged 1554

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

in title insurance transactions without a license. And it creates	1555
a new Adverse Claims to Deposit Accounts Act, protecting banks	
under certain circumstances from adverse claims levied against	1556
deposit accounts by persons who have loaned money to depositors.	1557
It passed the House 107 to nothing and was passed unanimously in	1558
committee. I would ask for a favorable roll call.	1559
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1561
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the	1563
question is, shall House Bill 2697 pass. Those in favor will vote	1564
Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?	1565
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the	1566
record. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, 1 Nay, 5 voting	1567
Present. House Bill 2697, having received the required	1568
constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Syverson, on	1569
House Bill 2702. Senator Syverson, 2702? Out of the record.	1571
Senator Raica, on House Bill 2725. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	1572
SECRETARY HARRY:	1574
House Bill 2725.	1576
(Secretary reads title of bill)	1578
3rd Reading of the bill.	1580
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1582
Senator Raica.	1584
SENATOR RAICA:	1586
Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 2725 amends the	1588
Environmental Protection Agency {sic} Act. It authorizes the	1591
Illinois EPA to grant transfer station authorization. It has	1592
been approved by the county board and by the local people, and I	1593
would just ask for its adoption, please.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1595
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Demuzio.	1597

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

SENATOR DEMUZIO:	1599
very much. As I understand this, this would be an	1601
exemption to the siting process that was passed years ago, 172,	1602
that would allow for a no public hearings and, for some reason	1603
or another, whatever else that the public could be commanded to	1604
or given the opportunity to do. Why are we doing this, and is	1605
this a departure from the previous practices?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1607
Senator Raica.	1609
SENATOR RAICA:	1611
Well, thank you, Senator Demuzio. That's a very good question.	1613
This facility has been functioning since 1972 and was functioning	1614
until 1993. They assumed, when the new owners took possession of	1615
the facility, that they were grandfathered in. They were	1616
instructed that they were grandfathered in, only to find out that	1617
they weren't. At that time, they were functioning as a transfer	
station, and they did have local approval from the for zoning.	1618
The residents support it, the county board supports it, in	1619
addition to the local municipality. And that's the reason why	1620
we're attempting to do this today. It passed out of the House on	1621
a very good roll call, and I would hope that it would do the same	1622
in this Body.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1624
Senator Demuzio.	1626
SENATOR DEMUZIO:	1628
So so that I understand it, then there was this company	1630
that was operating this facility prior to, then sold the facility	1631
to the new owners. And the new owners had the understanding that	1632
because of the purchase that they were grandfathered in and	1633

therefore the permits would just simply be transferred into their

names, and therefore they would not have to go back through the

siting process again. This is then to grandfather them in from

1634

1635

May 8, 1996 103rd Legislative Day their permit -- from the -- from the previous owners, and this 1637 would not require a public hearing, the county to make approval of 1638 the new permit and EPA to be involved in the issuance. Is that 1639 right? 1641 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 1643 Senator Raica. 1645 SENATOR RAICA: If they -- Senator Demuzio, my understanding on this concept 1647 was that they were informed that they would not have to go through 1649 the permit process since they had been functioning since 1972. 1650 1993, when this came up, it wasn't that big of an issue. There 1652 were two landfills that were in that community that were -- that 1653 Since then, one has closed, and they figure were functioning. within the next two years the other one's going to close, which 1654 means that county will have nothing and that's why the urgency to 1655 pass this legislation is before us today. 1656 1658 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 1660 Senator Demuzio. 1662 SENATOR DEMUZIO: Well, I would rise in opposition. I think the siting law that 1664 was put into effect, the siting process, in allowing and involving 1665 the public back into the process of siting, would be circumvented 1666 by the passage of this law. And this would certainly just 1667 signal to all of the other individuals who wanted to try to bypass 1668 the siting question to come directly to the Legislature. So, I 1669 would rise in opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Palmer.

1671

1672

1681

103rd Legislative Day

SENATOR PALMER:	1683
Senator Raica, wasn't this operation denied a permit in 1994?	1685
Aren't they in the process of appealing that denial?	1686
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1688
Senator Raica.	1690
SENATOR RAICA:	1692
Senator Palmer, I guess they were denied only let me see	1694
where I have that here. They were they thought they were	1695
exempted, but they were not. Since that would take over a year,	1696
they are requesting for Illinois EPA to be grandfathered in.	1697
And I guess my understanding is, that's what they were denied.	1698
They, in good faith, when they purchased this facility, thought	
that that they were already grandfathered in prior to	1700
purchasing this this property, and this has been functioning	1701
since 1972 and was first closed in 1993. So they were functioning	1702
for over twenty years.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1704
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) Further discussion? Senator Welch.	1704 1706
Further discussion? Senator Welch.	1706
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH:	1706 1708
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole	1706 1708 1710
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public	1706 1708 1710 1712
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill and now says that we want to take advantage of their existence	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill and now says that we want to take advantage of their existence prior to the passage of Senate Bill 172 in 1980. Well, if that's	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill and now says that we want to take advantage of their existence prior to the passage of Senate Bill 172 in 1980. Well, if that's the case, you could you could continually transfer these	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715 1716 1717
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill and now says that we want to take advantage of their existence prior to the passage of Senate Bill 172 in 1980. Well, if that's the case, you could you could continually transfer these landfills among individual companies without ever having any	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715 1716 1717
Further discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH: Thank you, Madam President. It seems to me that the whole purpose of the passage of Senate Bill 172 was to allow public input into the siting of landfills, transfer stations, or anything else dealing with garbage in local communities. It looks to me that what we have here is one company purchased another landfill and now says that we want to take advantage of their existence prior to the passage of Senate Bill 172 in 1980. Well, if that's the case, you could you could continually transfer these landfills among individual companies without ever having any public input. And I I think that the public is entitled to	1706 1708 1710 1712 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Raica has a -- has been known to be supportive of 1724 the environment throughout his career, but I -- I just think that this 1726 is not a good idea, to start making individual exemptions. 1728 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 1730 Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. 1732 SENATOR GEO-KARIS: Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I was 1734 a cosponsor, along with Senator Demuzio, of Senate Bill 172, and I 1736 think it's a good bill - still on the books. However, in this 1738 there is two provisions that have to be met. One is that 1739 the municipal -- of six -- four, rather. One, that the site has zoning approval and, two, that the municipal waste transfer 1740 -- transfer station was in existence on or before January 1, 1979, 1742 and was in continuous operations from that date to January 1, 1743 key provision is that the operator 1744 can 1993. another demonstrate -- has to demonstrate that the county board or the municipal governing body does not object to resumption of 1745 Therefore, I think it has enough 1746 operation of the station. safeguards in the bill and I think it's a good bill under 1747 the circumstances. And with those safeguards, I certainly urge a -- a 1748 favorable consideration. 1750 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 1752 Further discussion? Senator Lauzen. 1754 SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President. Just a quick question 1756 for the sponsor. Is this an exception to the site hearing 1759 process, and if it is, why don't these folks go through and have a 1760 hearing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Raica. 1764

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Lauzen, this facility, as I stated, has been 1768

1762

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

1981, they 1769 functioning since '72. When the law passed ín were allowed to function until 1993. They're -- they had, at that 1770 time, everyone's authorization. And since this is a -- not 1771 landfill - this is a transfer station - they had a -- trash compactor that they used to transfer the waste into this site out 1772 this site. It's -- it was not a landfill. They're not really 1774 bypassing the -- the siting, per se. In good faith, when 1775 entered into -- into this agreement, they assumed that they were 1776 grandfathered in, and that's why this was purchased to -- to -- to it originally. The county has no objection to it. The locals --1777 newspaper article in which they -- the local 1778 a -- a people were not opposed to it. It would actually benefit 1779 for the mere fact it has been functioning for that long period of 1780 a time. It has been there. Ιt is there. They have had no problem with it. They're -- the reason of the urgency is because 1781 of the fact that their one landfill, as I stated, is going -- has 1782 closed and another one, they assume, is going to close in two 1783 years, and they have asked this Body to attempt to -- to get this 1784 approved because, in good faith, when they entered that agreement, 1785 they thought that they were going to be grandfathered... 1787

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Go next door to Senator... Okay. Stand at 1789 Senator Lauzen. ease for a minute, Ladies and Gentlemen. This one works. Senator 1792 Demuzio, I'm afraid your mike won't work. That's why we're on 1793 hold right now. I can't -- I can't put your mike on, sir, because 1794 it won't work. That's why we're in a hold. So, forgive me. ... Mahar seeks leave of the Body for Richard G. Hesslau to take 1795 some videotape of the Senate Floor. Is leave granted? Leave is 1796 Again, I will state, we're in kind of a hold here. 1797 microphones aren't working. We're working on that. And the voting 1798 We can't vote. ... Carroll, for what purpose do you seek svstem. 1799 recognition?

103rd Legislative Day May 8, 1996

Thank you, Madam President. I just realized that 1803 inadvertently, before the damage to the system, that the record 1805 had shown that I had voted No on -- on House Bill 1645. I had 1807

SENATOR CARROLL:

intended to vote Yes, and I would like the record to so reflect.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1809
The record will so reflect right. I think we're back on	1811
track here. We're on House Bill 2725, sponsored by Senator Raica.	1812
Senator Walsh.	
SENATOR WALSH:	1814
Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield for	1816
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1818
Indicates he'll yield, Senator Walsh.	1820
SENATOR WALSH:	1822
Senator Raica, could could you tell me where in Westmont	1824
this is located?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1826
Senator Raica.	1828
SENATOR RAICA:	1830
Thank you. Hello? It's in Westmont on the DuPage County	1832
side, Senator Walsh.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1834
Senator Walsh.	1836
SENATOR WALSH:	1838
What part of Westmont is in any other county? But, no, I'm	1840
I'm curious. Is this is a transfer station?	1842
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1844
Senator Raica.	1846
SENATOR RAICA:	1848
Yes.	1850

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Senator Walsh.

1852

1854

1801

103rd Legislative Day

SENATOR WALSH:

SENATOR WALSH:

There is there is support from the locals, the mayor and so	1858
forth for this transfer station?	1859
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1861
Senator Raica.	1863
SENATOR RAICA:	1865
Yes.	1867
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1869
Senator Walsh.	1871
SENATOR WALSH:	1873
And one last question, Senator Raica. I appreciate you taking	1875
the time to answer these. Was it was this transfer station in	1876
operation and put out of business by the passage of House Bill	1877
1594?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1879
Senator Raica.	1881
SENATOR RAICA:	1883
No. They were affected by I think it was Senate Bill 172	1885
in 1981, although they were allowed to function till about 1983	1886
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1888
Senator Walsh. Oh.	1890
SENATOR WALSH:	1892
Did did the passage of of House Bill 1594 have an effect	1894
on on the operation of this place?	1895
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1897
Senator Raica.	1899
SENATOR RAICA:	1901
Not that I'm aware.	1903
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1905
Senator Walsh. Senator Walsh.	1907

This -- I just wanted to point out that -- that this bill is 1911

1909

May 8, 1996

1856

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

2725 is similar to a bill that we had earlier in the Session,	1912
House Bill 1089, which we passed legislation which had an	1913
unintended effect, and we've had to go back and to help people.	1915
And the unintended effect of this was we were putting someone out	
of business, this company that Senator Raica is trying to help:	1916
Browning-Ferris. And the unintended effect of House Bill 1089 was	1917
putting a small businessman, the Flood Brothers, out of business.	1919
And I think we have to realize, occasionally, when we make	1920
mistakes and go back and and help these people, and I stand in	
strong support of your bill.	1921
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1923
Senator Dillard.	1925
SENATOR DILLARD:	1927
Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the	1929
Senate. I just want to point out to the Body that this particular	1931
transfer station is in my Senate district. It's one transfer	1932
station. It's been, essentially, in existence since when I was in	1933
high school, and the local municipality's mayor, as well as the	1934
county board in DuPage, stand in support of this bill as well.	1935
And it's one transfer station. It's in my district. It's been	1936
around for ages. And I certainly rise in in support of it.	1937
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1939
Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.	1941
SENATOR KARPIEL:	1943
Well, thank you, Madam President. I just want to say that I	1945
find it a little bit ironic that Senator Raica is sponsoring this	1947
bill, since he voted No on House Bill 1089, which was a similar	1949
type occurrence, as Senator Walsh said. I think, though, that we	1951
all in this Body, we should realize that when we pass	
legislation that affects businesses or people - whatever - that's	1952
that is already operating and in practice, that we should, in	1954

fact, exempt them or grandfather them in and let them continue 1955

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

operating. This one -- this business was put out of -- out of business for awhile because of the passage of SB172, the siting 1956 bill. The Flood Brothers will shortly be out of business as well, 1957 because House Bill 1089 is held up in the House, somewhere in this 1959 Chamber -- I mean, these Chambers here, floating around in limbo. 1960 And I am supportive of this bill because I'm supportive of 1962 business getting into these kind of situations over legislation that is passed by this -- this Assembly. But, very 1963 think House Bill 1089 deserves to get a hearing over in the House 1965 as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

1967 1969

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

1971

SENATOR HENDON:

1973

Thank you, Madam President. I think it's important that point out the difference between this situation and the Flood 1974 Brothers, since this is brought up under discussion. Senator 1975 Dillard has said that this is in his district, and the Senator, 1977 from whose district this is in, is in support of it. I think that 1978 makes a tremendous difference, and I commend Senator Raica for his 1979 Flood 1980 vote on 1089 because the Senator in which 1089 - the Brothers - is located was vehemently opposed to that. And, 1982 therefore, because the Senator from this district is supportive of 1984 it, then I intend to vote Aye, and I believe that we all should 1985 sometimes - most times - look to the Senator whose district is 1986 this legislation. If Senator Dillard was being affected by in his district, I would vote No. But Senator 1988

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Dillard said he is for it, and I vote Yes.

1990 1992

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

1993

SENATOR RAICA:

1995

Thank you, Madam President. I would just ask for a favorable 1997

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	1999
The question is, shall House Bill 2725 pass. Those in favor	2001
will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted	2002
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?	2003
Take the record. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, 5 Nays,	2005
none voting Present. House Bill 2725, having received the	
required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator	2006
Watson, on House Bill 2737. Out of the record. Senator Mahar, on	2008
2747. Out of the record. Top of page 6 is House Bill 2836.	2009
Senator Burzynski. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.	2010
SECRETARY HARRY:	2012
House Bill 2836.	2014
(Secretary reads title of bill)	2016
3rd Reading of the bill.	2018
PROGRAM OFFICER (GENEROL PONNIUE)	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	2020
Senator Burzynski.	2020
Senator Burzynski.	2022
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2022
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the	2022 2024 2026
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We began discussion on this bill last week relative to	2022 2024 2026 2027
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We began discussion on this bill last week relative to the tuition funds that were generated by State universities and	2022 2024 2026 2027 2028
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We began discussion on this bill last week relative to the tuition funds that were generated by State universities and the fees generated by State universities being transferred to the	2022 2024 2026 2027 2028 2029
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We began discussion on this bill last week relative to the tuition funds that were generated by State universities and the fees generated by State universities being transferred to the State for reallocation back to the individual institutions. There	2022 2024 2026 2027 2028 2029
Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We began discussion on this bill last week relative to the tuition funds that were generated by State universities and the fees generated by State universities being transferred to the State for reallocation back to the individual institutions. There was a considerable amount of discussion the other day, some	2022 2024 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030

really accurately reflect everything that we do with oversight in

the State of Illinois. These schools still have oversight by their

own college boards, as well as by the State Board of Education,

and still 2.7 billion dollars of funding that goes to higher education is overseen by this Body. So, I would be more than happy

2034

2035

2036

2037

May 8, 1996 103rd Legislative Day 2038 to answer any questions that might come forward. 2040 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 2042 Is there any discussion? Senator Demuzio. 2044 SENATOR DEMUZIO: Well, thank you, Madam President. This is a tremendous 2046 departure from what we have done in the past here. It seems to me 2047 that it is a legislative prerogative of this Body in order to 2048 Is -- is it my continue to appropriate the income funds. 2049 understanding that the universities now would retain the income funds in their own account and then they would draw the interest, 2050 they would not spend the money until the Legislature gives 2051 approval? Is that what -- is that what we're -- we're talking 2052 about in this bill now? 2054 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 2056 Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI: 2058 Senator, I'm not sure that they would be obligated to not 2060 spend the funds until legislative approval; however, they would 2062 keep the funds in a separate income fund account to be utilized 2063 much in the same way they are now. 2065 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE) 2067 Senator Demuzio. 2069 SENATOR DEMUZIO: Well, I think this is a terrible practice. It just seems to 2071 me that that is a prerogative of the General Assembly. We ought 2072 not to give it away. It seems to me that the universities have --2073 you know, are usurping their power, at least in this particular 2075 The legislative appropriations process would be violated, 2076 and I would stand in opposition. 2078 PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

2080

2082

103rd Legislative Day

Question of the sponsor. The Senator, the interest drawn	2084
on assuming that you would do this, the interest drawn on this	2085
money, what what will will they add that to their budget or	2086
to next year's appropriation, or how would that be done?	2087
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	2089
Senator Burzynski.	2091
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2093
The interest that would be earned on the budgets would be kept	2096
locally, Senator. The university would use it in their income	2097
fund. They could utilize those funds to either reduce their cost	2099
to students, reduce their fees, or also to keep for next year's	2100
expenses.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONAHUE)	2102
Senator Collins.	2104
SENATOR COLLINS:	2106
Senator, how much money if you would take their budget from	2108
last year and and segregate those funds and allow and take	2110
it out of the Treasurer State Treasurer, how much money could	2111
have possibly been earned - interest on that money - total amount	2112
of money?	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2114
Senator Burzynski. Senator Burzynski.	2116
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2118
Thank you. My understanding, Senator, is it's someplace	2120
between 2.9 and four million dollars of interest earned.	2121
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2123
Senator Palmer. I mean, Senator Collins. I'm sorry.	2125
SENATOR COLLINS:	2127
Senator, had they invested that money through the Treasurer,	2129
as as we often do now to generate more income, to motivate and	2130
stimulate and assist investments and those kinds of community	2132
development projects that hopefully create jobs, and and for	2133

103rd Legislative Day

the formation of capital at the community level to add more	
revenue to the State Treasurer, don't you think that we would have	2134
get more benefit as a State out of that money by allowing the	2135
money to remain in the Treasury?	2136
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2138
Senator Burzynski.	2140
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2142
Well, Senator, I guess what what I would argue is the fact	2144
that these funds are collected locally. They are not State	2145
dollars, per se, when they come into our General Fund. And	2146
certainly I think that we should allow these universities to to	2147
or, to encourage these universities to use tuition funding to	2148
keep their expenses down to the students.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2150
Senator Collins.	2152
SENATOR COLLINS:	2154
Well, I I just disagree with you. I think, like Senator	2156
Demuzio said, this is a very bad precedent. Supposing every other	2158
agency and institution decided that they want to come and keep	2159
their money, and then from there on we would have no State	2160
Treasury; we will have no money to invest to to generate new	
revenue. It's it's a major part of generation of new revenue,	2161
the money that the Treasurer place in banks and invest and and	2162
and generate interest, new income, for the State. So I think	2163
it's a bad, bad idea.	
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2165
Any further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.	2167
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	2169
Thank you. Would the sponsor yield for a question?	2171
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2173
He indicates that he will.	2175
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	2177

103rd Legislative Day

Senator Burzynski, is is the Treasurer's Office in support	2179
or opposition to this bill?	2181
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2183
Senator Burzynski.	2185
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2187
They're not in support.	2189
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	2191
Is the Comptroller Senator, is the Comptroller's Office in	2193
support or opposition?	2194
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2196
Senator Burzynski.	2198
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2200
They're not in support.	2202
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2204
Senator Rauschenberger.	2206
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	2208
Senator, is the Governor's Office and the Bureau of the Budget	2210
in support or opposition to this bill?	2211
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2213
Senator Burzynski.	2215
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:	2217
They're not in support.	2219
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)	2221
Senator Rauschenberger.	2223
SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:	2225
I certainly appreciate the sponsor's desire to deal with an	2227
institution in his district, and I certainly respect and admire	2228
the the kind of cross-purposes that some Members have with	2229
institutions of higher education in their district. But I'd like	2231
to point a couple things out. Tuition dollars paid to State	2232
school are State revenues. They don't belong to the University of	
Illinois, or Illinois State University, or Southern Illinois	2233

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

University, or Eastern, or any other university. They're part of 2234 a State system. They are State-supported. They should be subject 2235 to State appropriation oversight. I have to question the motives 2236 of the universities. We are less than one year into a major 2237 management reorganization of the universities. We've eliminated 2238 the intermediate boards. As I spoke to the sponsor before and have spoken to a number of the universities, they should prove two 2239 years of stewardship and get their house in order before they come 2240 for this kind of authority. One has to look no further 2241 than some of the things that are happening in the higher education 2242 foundations and some of the concerns that have been raised about 2243 the higher education pension administration. There should be appropriation oversight. I urge Members to carefully consider 2244 this bill and vote No. 2246

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

2248

Any further discussion? Senator Carroll.

2250

SENATOR CARROLL:

I just 2252

Madam President, Members of the Senate. want to say I'm proud to say, I guess, that I'm joining the 2253 Treasurer, the Comptroller, the Governor, 2254 the Bureau of the Ι 2255 Budget; that I am not in support either to the sponsor. And to the comments of Chairman the similar think, very three-million-dollar raid on 2257 Appropriations, this is a three million dollars out of the State 2258 Ιt is taking Treasury to add to these schools. These are -- these are State 2259 Ιf They should be in the State Treasury. these dollars. 2260 universities want it, let them go private. Then they don't have be subject to State appropriations; they don't have to be in 2261 the State Treasury. Let them become private institutions and 2262 stop taking the State subsidy that keeps their tuitions low 2263 because of other taxpayer dollars. It is not fair for them to try 2264

and steal another three million dollars out of the State Treasury

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

to the harm of all others, when, in fact, they've done very well. Their request for funding the last two years has been exactly what has been appropriated by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor. If they needed three million dollars more, they should have made the request straight up and not try to do it by back door. I think this is a terrible idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Maitland.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the -- of the Senate. As a former Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman, I disagree with the present Senate Appropriations Committee Chairperson, and another former Appropriations Committee Chairperson, and the Governor, and the Comptroller, and the Treasurer. I rise in support -- I rise in support of -- of House Bill 2836. it's amazing to me how sometimes in this Chamber and this General Assembly we are in a mode of independence in giving flexibility to agencies of State government and universities and the like, and that, frankly, was one of the purports of the -- of the -- of the -- of the reorganization that we passed a couple of years ago. This gives the universities some flexibility. The Appropriations Committee will have oversight. The State will have oversight. These numbers aren't hidden. They're not hidden at all. We know what they have. The State subsidy that Howard --Senator Carroll refers to is absolutely the -- the portion from

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

the State that they get that adds to and supplements the tuition. And this simply gives the universities — the individual universities — the flexibility to have the dollars in place and to use them in a given fiscal year. That's the mode of the future, Ladies and Gentlemen. You ought to support House Bill 2836.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

It would be very nice if we could hear the speakers when they speak. And I ask the indulgence of this great Body of Senators to give their attention to the speakers. I'd appreciate it. Further -- further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Indicates he will heed.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator, is this primarily pass-through money? What I mean by that is that there is no real value gained. It comes from the local to the State, and then it turns around and goes back to the universities. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes, Senator, that is correct. It is flow-through dollars. Really, you know, we've got a lot of discussion here about the fact that this is an appropriations issue when it really isn't. It's -- it's primarily a cash-flow issue for those universities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Since on my analysis all of the universities -- the major universities are in support of this, it would seem to me that there is some common need that this addresses. Could you tell me

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

about that, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, absolutely. In fact, this General Assembly has approved supplemental appropriations for Chicago State University at least twice that I can think of, because they were unable to access their local tuitions and fees - those funds being held by the State. So I think that's a prime example of the need to go ahead and pass this legislation, to give those universities flexibility within their current budgets.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

As I understand it, Senator, one example of flexibility would be that, in the -- in September or August when universities open their doors, it's often not known how many core sections they will need for such basic courses, for example, as biology, English and so forth. And they do not know really until the last minute how -- what their population is going to be - the student population. So I understand this allows them then to open more sections in order to meet that student need.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes, Senator, that is correct. This will allow universities flexibility to meet the needs of their enrollment trends, as they — as they approach their enrollments and as they look at their registrations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Just to close, then. I stand in support of this legislation. I think that it does meet a need. And as Senator Maitland pointed out, I didn't support the move to give each of these universities but since we've done it and we said that we wanted them to act on their own behalf, then it seems to me this is part of that action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussions? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President. The other day the president of one of the universities came to see me and asked me to support this bill, and I told him I couldn't because of the loss of three to four million dollars to the State budget. And his response was very interesting. He said that the universities had talked among themselves and they had agreed they'd be willing to give back the money the State would lose. They think they could make more money than we can here in the State of Illinois on their behalf. So it seems to me that a compromise could very easily be worked out here by changing the appropriations to the universities to make up for this lost three million dollars. Not once in the sponsor's speech has he mentioned that they want the three million dollars; it's the oversight issue. Well, it seems to me we'd be willing to give them the oversight, let us keep the money, and we'll have a happy medium. But until then, I think we should be voting No until there is some agreement as to how this is going to work out. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

SENATOR SHAW:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator, how much money are we talking about -- how much money are we talking about not appropriating here with the ten universities that are involved? Do you -- can you tell us that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

The -- the estimate, Senator, are about four hundred million dollars. That would leave over -- approximately 2.7 billion dollars that would still be appropriated and handled by the State. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

I have an analysis here. It said four hundred and forty-six million dollars. Now, how is this money -- where -- where does this money -- how do -- the university -- explain to us, how does the university get this amount of money -- excess amount of money? How does this come about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

First of all, Senator, this is not excess funds. These are funds that are now brought into the State General Revenue funds and reappropriated by the Appropriations Committee and by the General Assembly. So they're not excess dollars. And we're not talking here about, I think, a control issue so much either, as we are about a cash-flow issue and how the universities can utilize their funds. Senator Welch mentioned the fact that -- that we'd not talked about the three or four million dollars worth of interest, that there would be the possibility of that coming back. We can simply address that through the Appropriations Committee yet this year. That is not a major problem. It's not a major concern. But, certainly, these are not excess funds. These are

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

funds that go back to the universities already. They are flow-through funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Just for your information, I don't have any problems with the -- with the funds going back to the university, but let's see if I'm correct. These are -- this money is derived from students' tuition, and that's what I mean in excess - either overcharging by the university, or you might want to call it something else. But there is four hundred and forty-six million dollars left from the fee increase that the universities last year -- or, year before that they increased the tuition. Is that what we're talking about here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, Senator, I -- I'm a little bit confused, but let me try and clarify. We, as a -- as a Body, approve the tuition rates that are charged at our State universities. So I -- I'm not sure that I call those excess funds. If you're concerned that there will be little oversight relative to universities increasing tuition funds, I -- I would submit to you that -- that, through the appropriations process, we can deal with that issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Just to the bill: This bill has been around as -- practically as long as I've been in the Legislature. When I was in the other Chamber, this bill has been around. And, certainly, I don't see any different now than I saw at that time when I was on Appropriation. If -- if we allow this money to -- the

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

just to use this money as discretionary funds as universities they see fit - and that's what it amounts to here if it don't come through the appropriation process - we might as well go home There are other agencies that charge fees, too. sit on our hands. Should they be allowed to do the same thing? That's the precedent that you are setting here by allowing the universities to do this. I think it's a -- it's a danger in this, in terms of the appropriation process. I would urge all of the Members that they should take a look at this, and certainly I'm not against the universities. I -- I want the universities to have the money, but I don't see any difference than them -- the money coming through the appropriation process, coming through this Body, and then going back to the university. But if we're not going to do just go home and sit down and let the other certainly we should agencies have their money, the fees that they generate in excess. You might not call it an excess, but it is an excess. And, certainly, I would urge a No vote on this -- on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to this bill. I want to ask Senator Burzynski, would he be willing to take it out of the record? Well, I -- I see he's indicating no, and I -- I just hate to see you have a bad day at the plate. But it appears that you're going to have that today, because there's bipartisan opposition to taking away our fiscal responsibility. Senator Shaw is absolutely correct, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Chamber. If we do this, we may as well just let every agency or every branch of our government that collects any kind of fees, or anything, just don't turn any money in to the Treasurer, don't let the Comptroller look at any of the books. Just -- let the departments and the different agencies get the money and do

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

whatever they want and tell us whatever they wish. I stand in strong opposition to this bill. And in support of the Chairman of Appropriations, he has every right to be appalled at this attempt to take money away from General Revenue funds. And I have a university in my district, but I will let them know that they, too, have to abide by the rules and this would set a terrible precedent. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Madam President. Well, will the Senator yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

'SENATOR BUTLER:

Senator, as I understand it, and correct me, or help me to understand this, I guess is a better way of saying it, the funds that are -- come back from the university, are they redistributed back to them on a dollar-for-dollar basis?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes, Senator. Most -- most frequently they are. It's a dollar-for-dollar. However, that transaction takes place many months after the tuition funds and the fees are collected by the university.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I'm a little wary of that word "usually", or whatever temporary word you used in there. The second part of my question is, that money is -- goes into the common fund, so to speak, and it's redistributed to that university. Do we dictate how that

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

money will be spent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Only through -- only through the appropriations process that we have now, when we tell them what funds their -- their -- or, what budgets their funds may be spent in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

I'm sorry. I worded that very poorly. What I'm asking is, is there a -- in the -- in the appropriation process, is there -- are there specific line items, for -- for example? What I'm -- what I'm getting at, do we now dictate where that money will be spent? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Can we have it a little bit more orderly? Thank you. Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator, I believe that there are some designated funds that those dollars must be spent in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Could Senator Rauschenberger clear that, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Would you repeat the question again, real quick? I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler, would you please repeat your question clearly? SENATOR BUTLER:

The question is: When the money comes from the university back

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

to the State and before it's -- and when it's reappropriated, is it designated spending? That -- are those funds isolated in any way? Do we know what happens to that money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, when -- when tuition's collected, it's -- it's collected by the Treasury, and then it's appropriated, or designated, by the -- the General Assembly to spending purposes at the universities. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- Senator Butler, are you done, sir?

Thank you. I -- I think I have my answer. It goes into a -- a common pot, so to speak. So it's lost in the -- in the distribution. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President and other Members. You know, I don't want to belabor this, but I -- I don't want to make it seem that all-important, you know, this -- this stuff about they're appalled, or if we do this where we're headed with it, you know, the -- the "chicken little" theory that the sky is falling. I don't think it's that big of a thing that we're looking for here. There's 2.7 billion that's still going to be appropriated. We're talking about four hundred million dollars. We just did the whole reorganization. Let them take a look at this. We could always take it back. I know if you're part of Appropriations, and Senator Carroll and Senator Rauschenberger, there may be some thing that we don't want to give up anything that we're -- you know, if we open the door a little bit, why not this agency, why

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

not that agency, but we can look at this in six months or a year, see if they've acted responsibly. I think what they're asking here is very small. I understand we don't want to give up our -- our power, but we still get to overlook 2.7 billion dollars. So if you don't want to give them this little bit, don't give it to them. But let's not act like we're giving away the State of Illinois here and usurping our financial responsibility, because that's not in this bill. And I urge a vote -- a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

I'm really concerned here where I see the opponents are the Comptroller, the Treasurer and the -- the Budget Bureau. Is there something there that I don't know about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, Senator, I think that their concern centers around the three million dollars or so in interest earned, and not really the effect that this bill has or the policy direction that this bill goes. So, you know, I think those things can be addressed through Senator Rauschenberger's Appropriations Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

The point being, when you, as a sponsor, do not have the cooperation of the people that are responsible for our monies, I would think that you would behoove yourself by listening to them,

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

perhaps, and then coming back here with some kind of an agreement that would be more palatable to all of us. And I would vote No on this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Mr. Burzynski, to close.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. First of all, this bill has -has generated a lot of discussion, and it's good discussion and I appreciate that on both sides of the issue, the pros and the cons. I think it's really important to point out that what we're trying to do here is really address a cash-flow situation that exists in many of our State universities. For those of you that are opposed to this bill, I understand that, but I would respectfully urge you to consider when one of the State universities, which might be -which you might represent or be in your area, Chicago State University, comes to us for a supplemental appropriation, might be when we could have handled it that legislatively through this bill. First of all, this bill does streamline the collection process. It really does. It takes care -- provides for efficiencies for the universities. Comptroller and the Treasurer's Office. T+ also allows universities to carry forward income fund balances, allowing for better long-term planning. For those of you who think that State still doesn't -- or, doesn't control them, yes, the State still controls a sizable portion of their allocations - about 2.7 billion dollars. I think that's important to point out. that you have to understand that we have oversight of these universities currently through the General Assembly, through the Board of Higher Education, and also by the Audit Commission, which has taken a more proactive role now, as we have the individual governing systems for each university. I would emphasize,

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

opinion, these are not State dollars. These are funds that are -that are contributed by local universities, and therefore, deserve
a chance to have -- to stay there. I think it's very appropriate
for us to point out it's a good bill. It allows more flexibility
with our universities. I would ask and solicit an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall House Bill 2836 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Had — have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared duly passed. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Could we see if they're all in their seats, and in the Chamber, and ask for a little verification?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- Senator Demuzio has requested a verification. Will all Senators be in their seat? The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Bomke, Bowles, Burzynski, Butler, Cronin, Cullerton, DeAngelis, DeLeo, Dillard, Donahue, Dunn, Farley, Geo-Karis, Hawkinson, Karpiel, Luechtefeld, Mahar, Maitland, Molaro, O'Daniel, Palmer, Peterson, Petka, Raica, Rea, Sieben, Walsh, Watson, Weaver and Woodyard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator Raica.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Raica. Is Senator Raica here? He's right there. All six feet of him. Who else, Senator Demuzio?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I don't want to verify anybody over here. So is anybody over there I should?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I don't think so.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

What about Senator Walsh? Is he here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He's standing up strong and tall. Are you done? Are you done, Senator Demuzio? Are you done? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I didn't -- what did you ask?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are you done?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

No. I was just looking to see all my friends, and I see some are for me and some aren't. And I just was curious as to -- no, I think that's it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

On -- on that question, on a verified roll call, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 23, and the -- this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared duly passed. House Bill 2900. Senator Fitzgerald. We'll read some Committee Reports first. We'll read Committee Reports.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Weaver, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Referred to Education Committee - Senate Amendment No. 2 to House

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Bill 1684, Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2230, and Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3426; referred to Environment and Energy Committee - House {sic} Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 2515; referred to Local Government and Elections Committee - Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2695, and Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3041; Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3670.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we're going back to House Bill 2900. Senator Fitzgerald. Madam Secretary, will you read the bill?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2900.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 2900 deals with the Senior Citizens Assessment Freeze Homestead Exemption, and it clarifies that if the applicant for the freeze dies, that his surviving spouse is eligible for the exemption, even if he or she is under sixty-five years of age but otherwise qualifies for the exemption. It clarifies that that surviving spouse will get the exemption for the taxable year preceding and the taxable year after the death of the spouse. I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the voting is open. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Aye. As I said, the voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

wished? Madam Secretary, take the roll. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared duly passed. House Bill 2916. Senator Raica. Senator Raica? Out of the record. House Bill 3050. Senator Maitland. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3050.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Madam President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 3050 is a bill that deals with the City of Streator. In 1987 they had entered into a consent decree with the IEPA to upgrade their -- their sewer project, and as a part of this design, as I understand it, they must -- they had to create a -- a first flush basin. And while it was under construction, severe flooding caused this basin to collapse into an abandoned coal mine that no one knew was there, and so they redesigned the project, and -- and in redesigning it, took on a little extra property found out that they were not -- or did not hold clear title to all the property. To make matters worse, the property that they did not hold clear title to was in -- in bankruptcy. And so what this does is allow for an extension -- a six-month extension and -- and allow for a quick-take deed to allow this first flush basin sanitary system project to proceed. This bill had no opposition in the House. It came out of committee unanimously. I know of no opposition. This is a must-do situation for this city, and I would seek the Body's support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3050 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3057. Senator Klemm? Out of the record. House Bill 3141. Senator Dillard. Madam Secretary, will you please read the bill?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3141.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 3141 splits the DuPage County Board and our Forest Preserve District into two separate elected entities, and it reduces the size of our county board in the County of DuPage by the corresponding amount of the new forest preserve commissioners that would be elected. This is supported by our local DuPage County Board, and its Chairman, Mr. Gayle Franzen, and I believe there is a mandate back home for this. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Demuzio. Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3141 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On that question, take the record, Madam Secretary. There

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

are -- there are 45 {sic} (55) voting Aye; there are none voting No: there are none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Madam President. On -- on House Bill 2900, I failed to push my button. I would like to have the record reflect that I would have voted Aye, had I been here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The record will be so noted, sir. Senator Maitland, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Madam President. I -- I rise on a point of personal privilege to -- to indicate that on House Bill 2697, I am reliably informed that I was shown as voting red, and I -- I, frankly, meant to vote green and I would like the record to so indicate my intent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The -- the record will so be indicated. Thank you. House Bill 3161. Senator Rauschenberger? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3161.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger. Senator Rauschenberger. Try the next. It looks like our voices are out again. So if you'll stand at ease for a few seconds -- few minutes until we get the voices back. I imagine the storm might have something to do with it, because there is a bad one out there. Stand at ease for a few minutes till we correct the mechanics.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I think our electricity is back. And I think we were on House Bill 3161. Are we ready yet? Stand at ease for about another minute or two, please. The electrician's working.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Our electricity is back in order, so we're ready to proceed again. Senator Rauschenberger, you were beginning to expound on your bill, and that's 3161. Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I -- I don't think I'd yet begun to expound, but I'll try to pick up where I might have left off. House Bill 3161 combines the good work that the Senate did in Senate Bill 1390 and Senate Bill 1391, both of which -- which passed out without any opposition in the Senate. It's a combination of two programs requested by the Environmental Protection Agency. Since both 1390 and 1391 are no longer alive in the House, it's incumbent upon us, hopefully, to move this bill. The bill has two provisions. The first provision creates statutory authority for the Department to enter into an emissions trading system and create a market for emissions

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

reductions, and the second part is the -- is a copy of the Federal XL Program, which allows property owners to enter into bilateral agreements, with the -- with the Environmental Protection Agency to provide cleanup that would be greater than normally required under the permit process. I urge a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall -- oh, I'm so sorry. Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

It's my fault, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

You're right.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger indicates he will.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, if my neighbors and I buy one of these surplus agreements, can we burn leaves and preempt the local ordinances?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Jacobs, it depends on whether or not we've passed a mandates amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall Senate -- House Bill 3161 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present, and this bill, having

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3193. Senator Butler? I'm sorry. House Bill 3165. Senator Mahar. Madam Secretary, will you read the bill?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3165.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill gives the Department of Nuclear Safety the power to subpoena witnesses attend and give testimony in administrative proceedings and -- or investigations and to subpoena the production of books, papers or records that are relevant or material to any such administrative proceedings or investigation. This is similar to what other agencies have. Committee Amendment No. 1 is agreed language between the Illinois State Medical Society and the Department of Nuclear Safety. It is a compromise which allows the Department to access the patient and patient records, but restricts access of the patient records after they are in the possession of the Department. There was no opposition in committee, and I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3165 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3193. Senator

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Butler? Out of the record. House Bill 3199. Senator Walsh? 3199? Out of the record. House Bill 3204. Senator O'Malley? Out of the record. House Bill 3282. Senator Peterson? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3282.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 3282 amends the Property Tax Code regarding homestead improvement exemptions, and this does not apply to Cook County. Under current law, homestead improvement exemption of up to thirty thousand per year may be taken if a proposed increase in assessed value is attributable solely to a new improvement of an existing structure. The amount of the exemption is applicable for the next four years or the next general assessment, whichever is later. If an assessment is increased due to an improvement, House Bill 3282 requires the appropriate assessing official to either notify the taxpayer that he or she may be eligible for the homestead improvement exemption, or grant it automatically.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will heed it.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, how would the notice to the homeowner be made?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Peterson. Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

It could -- as far as I know, it could -- it just says, either notify a taxpayer -- it could be by mail or verbally. I don't believe in the language in the bill it specifies, but they can also do it automatically.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. I had a -- I had a bill just like this a few years ago, and the objection was raised that the cost of the notification was going to be a problem. What we had worked out was the -- a notice would be on your annual tax bill to the -- to the homeowner. So -- but -- but I think this is a great idea, and I support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall Senate -- shall -- shall House Bill 3282 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present, and this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3309. Out of the record. House Bill 3348. Out of the record. House Bill 3396. Senator Barkhausen? Out of the record. House Bill 3447. Senator Bomke. House Bill 3447? Senator Bomke. Are you ready? Madam Secretary, will you read the bill?

House Bill 3447.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a voluntary effort to get farmers to do the right thing and protect urban water supplies by establishing a grass strip of sixty-six feet wide along tributaries that feed urban reservoirs in order to filter the water as it leaves a farm field, thus keeping the soil and fertilizers or chemicals on the field and out of the water supply. In -- in an attempt to get farmers to voluntarily do this, their assessed evaluation (sic) would be reduced, and I'd be happy to answer any questions anyone might have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Senator Bomke, I -- I certainly support this. I -- I tried to get a question answered this morning and I -- I really don't have an answer for it yet. But, as I understand it, in this bill, it can be a -- a minimum of sixty-six feet wide. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

That is correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes. Okay. If it has a -- a minimum width of sixty-six feet, what is the maximum? And what I was trying to get at, could I put a forty-acre field next to a stream into this filter strip and still get a sixth off?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, there is no maximum. Sixty-six feet is the width.

That -- it cannot be any less than that, nor can it be more than that and get a tax credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this legislation. I think it's probably one of the better pieces of legislation that came out of here for some times, and not only does it help the farmer, it helps all of our society. as -- as Senator Bomke said, it -- it keeps silt out of our municipal water supplies, out of the road ditches. Also it -- it provides some habitat now -- it would provide habitat for upland game, like quail, and -- and pheasant, and rabbit, and things of this nature, since we've -- did away with all of the hedgerows. And as the federal farm program moves into -- as they phase it out over the next seven years, there'll be a lot of land taking -- put back into production, where we're farming from fencerow to fencerow, and -- and I think there'll be some fragile land. And if we can keep this silt out, it's going to help all of our society, and I would ask for everyone's support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3447 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, none voting No, 1 voting Present, and this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Now, the next

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

bill is House Bill 3451. Senator Bomke, did you wish to bring that back for -- to 2nd Reading? Senator Bomke seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3451 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3451. Senator Bomke. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senators Bomke and Luechtefeld.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Madam President. This amendment would allow for a voluntary intergovernment agreement between the Sheriff's Office, Cook County, Department of Corrections and Public Aid, to do a cross-reference and a monthly check to determine how many of those who are incarcerated are receiving a public aid check, in an attempt to get those off the public aid rolls that are incarcerated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of this amendment, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it in the opinion of the Chair. The amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3455. Senator Dillard. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3455.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard, did you wish to recall this bill to 2nd Reading? Senate -- Senator Dillard seeks leave of the -- the Body to return House Bill 3455 for the purpose of tabling an amendment. Is that correct, Senator?

SENATOR DILLARD:

... Madam -- that is correct, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Would you make your motion, please?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Having voted on the prevailing side, and also being the sponsor of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3455, I would move to table that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, could you give us a little background as to what the amendment is about and why you're tabling it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard. Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Senator Cullerton, this amendment was for the Univen Refinery, which is in my particular Senate district, and they wanted the authority where they have an emergency police force or an emergency response team to also be able to eavesdrop. The amendment is -- it's not really controversial, but it may have problems in the House of Representatives across the rotunda. And I

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

prefer to take it off so that the bill then will be clean on 3rd Reading, and we're able to pass an eavesdropping bill -- an agreed eavesdropping bill without any baggage on to Governor Edgar either later today or tomorrow. I just want to take this off. It's for an emergency response unit. That's all it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, since it deals with an eavesdropping bill -- as understand, your eavesdropping bill was -- was a -- an attempt to modify the bill that we had passed last year, which I had - if you don't mind me saying - predicted was unconstitutional because it involved more than a single subject, and which was found to be unconstitutional by a judge yesterday. Now, had we known that that law was going to be unconstitutional, we might have had a different attitude in dealing with the interested witnesses and lobbyists, et cetera, with regard to the eavesdropping bill. was curious as to whether or not it was your intent to go to a conference committee with an eavesdropping bill in light of the fact that now we have none. There is no eavesdropping law that's operative in the State of Illinois. And to do -- to go to a conference committee on your bill you'd need to have an amendment. So that's why I was just curious. Is it your intention to just try to take this amendment off, pass the eavesdropping bill, which approved out of committee, even though that there's no eavesdropping law on the books? So that's why I wanted to ask your -- your comment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Senator Cullerton, if the Body so desires or concurs, it's my intent to strip this amendment off, and then pass this bill on 3rd

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Reading as it came over from the House within the next twenty-four hours. But, Senator Cullerton, there is a Senate bill in the House also dealing with the topic of eavesdropping where we can work on other amendments. Obviously, your input is sought, and we can take that Senate bill in the House, make some minor refinements. But with the opinion in the Circuit Court of Cook County yesterday, there are a number of us that feel it's incumbent that we pass a more scaled-down version down to Governor Edgar's desk, have him, hopefully, approve this so that we do have an eavesdropping law of some kind with respect to marketing on the books.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Anything further, Senator Cullerton? Senator Rea, further discussion?

SENATOR REA:

Thank you. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR REA:

I have a graduate student here from Denmark who is visiting the United States and Illinois. He'll be spending a couple months here, and I would like for you to all give him a great welcome to Illinois. His name is...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Welcome to Illinois, from Denmark. Senator Dillard, do you restate your motion again to reconsider the vote? The...

SENATOR DILLARD:

I wish to table House amendment -- or, excuse me, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3455.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All right. We are voting on the motion to reconsider. All those in favor, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed. In

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. And now to the motion that this bill -- this amendment be tabled. Senator Dillard. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the -- this amendment is tabled. Any -- any further amendments? ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3510. Senator Parker? Madam Secretary, will you read House Bill 3510?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3510.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the audience. House Bill 3510 amends the Unified -- I'm sorry. Of the Senate, pardon me. House Bill 3510 amends the Unified Code of Corrections to permit a sentencing court to terminate the sentence of an alien offender early if the federal government is prepared to deport the offender and a judge does not feel that deportation would deprecate the seriousness of the offense. This bill does the same as Senate Bill 1746, which passed out of the Senate earlier this Session. I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3510 be passed. And those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, none voting No, 3 voting

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3532. Senator Maitland? Out of the record. House Bill 3546. Senator DeAngelis. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3546.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 3546 allows an income tax deduction for unreimbursed home health care costs for those people who are over sixty-five years of age. There's two qualifications. One, the home care has to be delivered by a licensed service; and secondly, it has to be prescribed by a licensed practical nurse or a medical doctor. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

In the gallery right behind me are a group of students - eighth-grade students - from Arcola. I'd like the Senate to welcome them to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

We welcome you here. Thank you for coming to Springfield.

Any further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The sponsor will yield.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Senator DeAngelis, is that your fan club up there? The analysis that I have in my computer says that there is no fiscal impact estimated since there has not been a determination of how the deduction would be utilized. Do you have any -- any information as to how this would be utilized and -- and what the cost would be to the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

No, Senator Cullerton. But let me just tell you that, you know, in business, there are costs that are costs; some are investments. Hopefully, by the use of home health services, you keep people out of nursing homes and other more expensive facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Anything further, Senator? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Is there any means test applied to who can utilize this deduction, or could anyone of any income level be able to utilize themselves of the deduction?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

That's a good question, but there is no means test.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Anything further, Senator Cullerton? Any further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR RAICA:

I rarely stand up and question anything Senator Weaver has to say, but apparently there's something wrong with this picture, but if we are going to say this is the graduating class — eighth-grade class, I would like to mention that I would like to congratulate Mrs. Philip, who is part of that graduating eighth-grade class.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Well we certainly congratulate all of you. Further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield for a couple of quick questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I think he will.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, is this deduction analogous to the -- the -- the health care insurance deduction that -- that was moved last year when we had the kind of broad-based discussion that Illinois has a flat tax, very simple, with very few deductions and very few credits? Is this roughly the same type of thing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, we are not altering the tax structure. Yes, in terms of deductions, this is a deduction against your income.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

So, at the same time, again, that the federal government -our federal -- our federal colleagues are looking at
simplification, we're headed down the road of -- of creating
deductions and exemptions and credits to a simple flat tax that we
have in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, Senator Rauschenberger, if you're accustomed to paying taxes, and I'm sure you are, you will find out there's quite a few lines after line thirty-two that this can be applied to. There's a lot of space.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

So, did -- we did kind of open a door when we decided that health premiums, perhaps, were deductible and for the -- correct me if I'm wrong, but if, for example, I were to spend a thousand dollars on -- on maintaining myself at home in health services that somehow were to be qualified, that the tax deduction I would get would have a value to me of thirty dollars. Is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thirty-five dollars, I believe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Would you -- thirty or thirty-five? Would you -- wouldn't it be thirty dollars with a three-percent tax rate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator DeAngelis.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Okay. It's thirty -- thirty bucks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

In -- in closing, I just -- I guess I would caution Members that, again, we're kind of headed down a path here of complicating a flat-rate, simple income tax. Last year we talked about the dangers of allowing health insurance to be deductible, and now we're -- kind of have an undefined group of health services, which may or may not qualify. And the last thing is, keep in mind we do not have an IRS in the State of Illinois; we do not have the capability to do the same kind of auditing the feds do. So when you have complex and not well-defined deductions, you kind of put your Tax Code and your revenue sources at risk. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any -- any further discussion? Any further discussion?

Hearing none, do you wish to close, Senator DeAngelis?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, normally I would not respond to that, but, Senator Rauschenberger, there are qualifications. If you were listening to what I was saying, there had to be two qualifications. And then I don't know what you mean by "complicating" the system. In fact, this morning as I was listening to the radio, the federal government is, at this point, as we speak, voting on a bill would allow eighty-percent deduction for people who are insuring themselves. Okay? If you're saying complicating means we're not following the federal form, I would agree with you; we're not doing this. But I have to tell you, look at the upside. This would keep people out of facilities that normally will deductible, and hopefully we keep them in home health care, which is less expensive.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are you closing? Are you done?

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Yes. I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further... The question is, shall House Bill 3546 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all those who wish to vote voted? Have — all those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. Take the record, Madam Secretary. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 2 voting No, none voting zero — none voting Present, rather. And this — this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3549. Senator Molaro, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

A point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Would you state your point of personal privilege, Senator Molaro?

SENATOR MOLARO:

In our illustrious Body today, coming up from Chicago to testify and be part of our process later in Appropriations, is the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Aurelia Pucinski.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Welcome, Ms. Pucinski. Aurelia Pucinski. House Bill 3549. Senator Sieben? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3549.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Sieben.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

SENATOR STEBEN:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the -of the Senate. This bill amends the Illinois Lottery Law, and
adds some provisions to deal with people who handle fraudulent or
false tickets. It also makes some changes regarding the use of
the funds; would allow for the transfer of the excess interest
fund into the Lottery Fund, which would benefit directly the
Common School Fund. Know of no opposition, and I move for the
passage of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 3549 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting No, and none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3617. Senator Raica, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? Senator Raica seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3617 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3617. Will you read -- are there any amendments on the Floor?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Will you state the amendment, Senator Raica? SENATOR RAICA:

I will, Madam President. Amendment No. 2 deletes the word "distribution" and adds the word "care". That's all it does. I would just ask for its adoption.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

All right. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of this amendment, please signify by saying Aye. All opposed, say No. The opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments, Madam Secretary?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate -- House Bill 3625. Senator Fawell? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3625.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. House Bill 3625 is an agreed bill between the State Chamber of Commerce and the IEA {sic} (IEPA). We passed an identical bill over to the House on a 55 to nothing vote. It basically — what it does is it helps promote mutually agreed resolutions without resorting to litigation when there is a contaminated site. Does not hinder the Attorney General or the State's attorneys from instigating their own enforcement action independent of the IEA {sic} (IEPA), but it is a bill which, hopefully, will stop a lot of litigation. I will be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3625 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting No, and none voting Present. This bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Philip will now take the microphone.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

If I could have your attention for one minute, and I'd like to introduce fifty-four lovely, charming, sweet, debonair, suave ladies from the greatest Republican county in America, including my lovely wife, Nancy Louise, and the President of the DuPage County Women's Federation, the largest federation in the State of Illinois, Joan Salvato. So if they would please rise and be recognized by the Senate. And if this is the eighth-grade graduation class, we are in serious trouble. Going to the bottom of page 7. Senate Bill -- House Bill 3637. Senator Sieben. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 3637.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This legislation directs the Department of Revenue to include a statement of the appeal options available to taxpayers, either by law or Department rule, for each penalty for late payment, failure to file a tax return on or before the due date of filing, and failure to file correct information returns. That's all it does, and I'd ask for the passage of the bill.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? If not, Senator Sieben, to close. All right. The question is, House Bill 3637 pass. Those in favor of it will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have you all voted who wish? Have you all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, no voting Present. House Bill having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. ...Bill -- House Bill, excuse me, 3670. Fitzgerald, do you wish this bill to return to 2nd Reading for the purposes of amendment? Senator Fitzgerald seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3670 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 3670. Senator Fitzgerald. Read the amendment, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3670, offered by Senator Bomke.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment is in response to the Cook County Circuit Court's holding that P.A. 89-428 is unconstitutional, and although feel that the Appellate Court will reverse the Circuit Court's decision and hold the Act -- and determine that the Act is constitutional, it's important to offer this legislation to The legislation is -- is the same. protect our children. The pedophile stuff's the same that was contained in Senate Bill 721, including Sex Offender Community Notification Law; allowing for public access to names, addresses, conviction information of persons registered under the Sex Offender Registration Act for sex offenses committed against a child under eighteen, including registration of sex offenders; adds kidnapping and unlawful

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

restraint of a person under eighteen by someone other than a parent to the list of offenses for which registration is required. It includes all the pedophile and child criminal offenses that was contained in Senate Bill 721. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

He indicates he will. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, this bill did not go -- this amendment did not go to the Judiciary Committee, and it's a hundred -- hundred and eighty pages long. Is this amendment identical to the bill -- to that portion of the bill that we passed earlier this year that the judge found to be unconstitutional?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, that -- this portion of the bill is identical. That's correct.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Berman. I thought you had concluded. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. I wanted to see if the sponsor would yield to another question.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

He indicates he will. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, I spoke against that bill, specifically because of the problem with the single-subject issue, which was -- as I

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

indicated earlier, the -- the judge agreed with the argument. So perhaps we should be careful when we -- when we vote on this bill again, to make sure that there are no other constitutional issues. And -- and I have a question for you. This -- does this amendment apply retroactively to sex offenders who have already been released?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, the initial legislation did not, and does not, take effect until June 1st.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No. I don't think -- maybe I didn't make it clear. I'm not talking about the -- the effective date of the bill. I'm saying that once the bill becomes effective, does it apply to sexual offenders who have already been released, or is it prospective only?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Why doesn't this thing ever go out when you want it to? Senator, yes, it would be retroactive to those individuals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, would you like to, as the sponsor of the bill, indicate on the record whether or not you -- you think there's a -- why you don't think there's a constitutional problem? Ex post facto laws that we're passing to -- in other words, someone has already been sentenced, someone has already been released, they've served their

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

sentence. We are telling them that now they have to go and -and, in effect, register themselves. I can understand if we're
going to pass this prospectively, we tell people up front, "If you
get charged with this offense, found guilty and released, you have
to do this." But what about those people who have already been
out, been released? They've been out for ten years, fifteen
years, twenty years. They haven't done anything wrong. I'm afraid
that you might have a constitutional problem, and I just wanted to
know if you want to jeopardize the whole bill with this -- with
this Section.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you. We feel that this is not punishment. It's just merely asking them to -- requiring them to -- to register, therefore not unconstitutional.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Indicates he'll yield. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

In glancing at this hundred and -- hundred-and-eighty-page amendment, I don't see that it repeals the language that we adopted when we passed the bill that was ruled on in court yesterday or the day before. Is -- is there a repeal of the previous language in this amendment?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, I'm told that LRB indicates that does not have to

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

happen.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

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

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your point.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

In the gallery, to the rear, is St. Paul's School from Danville, Illinois, and one of the young students up there, and I hope I'm not making -- getting you mixed up with the class up here again, is the -- the cousin of Jo Johnson, one of our staff members, by the name of Mark Matayo.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Would they please rise and be recognized by the Senate?

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I -- I wasn't finished, but let me -- if Senator Bomke and staff would look at this. I am told that the reason LRB didn't include a repealer of the previous language was on the presumption that if the Judge Jaffe opinion is sustained by the Supreme Court, that would void the previous bill. However -- however, if the Supreme Court doesn't affirm the Jaffe decision, or the Jaffe decision isn't appealed, we've got -- and the Governor signs this, you've got two different Statutes on the books. Would you address that? Why should we have two different Statutes on the books?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm told that this happens all the time, and LRB will correct it with an advisory {sic}.

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Petka. Senator Petka. Senator Berman. SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm sorry. I was just trying to understand the response. Let me suggest -- let me suggest, and you make the decision, but I'm -- I'm being sincere. I'm not trying to pull your chain on this. I think -- you know, this has been produced overnight, literally. We're going to -- we're going to be here tomorrow. I would suggest that you take a second look, because we ought to repeal the bill we passed. That's why you want to move this one, and I think that that should be added in -- in other language. To repeal a bill is not LRB's function, and if the other case doesn't move or is overturned, you're going to have two different Sections. Now that's -- that's just my respectful suggestion that -- if you want to amend it today, but I really think that you ought to take out the language that was adopted by the bill that was ruled on in court the other day.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Let me inquire of the sponsor, if I might. Senator, I understand what we're doing with this. I'm a little bit concerned also with the issue that Senator Philip has spent a great deal of time on, and — and one which I support, and that is the LUST Fund. Now, I know that that was part of the other part of the bill that was declared to be unconstitutional because of the subject matter, but do you intend to do anything with the LUST Fund? I mean, there are like fifteen hundred and thirty-six of those individuals that are on this list, and a number of them have been bankrupted and — and been waiting for their reimbursement. Do you have an amendment also on some other bill that you intend to rectify that particular part of the problem that was ruled

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

unconstitutional, as well?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, I -- that's another subject. However, I -- I concur that is very important, and I understand there is a shell bill in the House that we're attempting to add that particular issue to.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I'm satisfied with that answer, that the -- and the Gentleman indicates that he'll -- you know, I guess, sponsor the bill when it comes over here to rectify that other part of the problem, because that's a serious problem, as well.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Collins. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Question of the sponsor, and I apologize if someone else -- if you've answered these questions, because I...

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR COLLINS:

I'm concerned here about confidentiality of -- of minors -- of children, and I'm looking at -- you're talking about children under -- I mean thirteen- and fourteen-year-olds, and even now we have ten-year-olds committing all kinds of crimes. This information -- who -- how will the confidentiality be protected once this information is given to the -- the schools and to all of these -- I mean, what will protect the -- the child, or have this confidentiality somehow we've been giving immunity -- granting immunity or totally against confidentiality in these cases?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, this has all been previously debated and acted on by this Body, and overwhelmingly support. The language has not changed. But I would ask, what line and page are you referring to, please?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

At this point, I mean, I just saw this amendment, and apparently we just -- it's something new that just got -- came out. So I'm not referring to anything, except a staff analysis and what I've heard here from the debate on the Floor, some questions. I'm concerned about what is going to happen to those young children, and whether or not we can do more damage and penalize them, or setting them aside for the rest of their lives once that they have paid for their crimes, and hopefully, we've rehabilitated them once they are incarcerated for whatever offense that they had committed. And are you saying that somehow this amendment allows them to, you know, to -- to report these kids? Does it continue to follow them the rest of their life wherever they go?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, this has all been debated. This -- this legislation is no different than it was when we acted on it in November. It's identical. There's nothing different than what we've already acted on.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3670, indicate by saying Aye. Those

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

opposed, Nay. Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

3rd Reading. Senator Cronin, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR CRONIN:

For purposes of an announcement.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Make your announcement.

SENATOR CRONIN:

The -- the Senate Education Committee shall meet in Room 400, immediately upon adjournment. Room 400.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Page 10 of today's Calendar, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. Senate Resolution 202. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 202, offered by Senator Donahue.

There were no committee or Floor amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Why, thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 202 deals with a situation that is taking place in my district in the County of Cass, in the City of Beardstown. And it deals with Land O' Lakes, a hog confinement that is being located there. Recently, in the construction of their hog lagoon, they struck groundwater, and we have a great deal of concern about the close proximity of the lagoon to the water table. And we are urging the Attorney General to look into this situation and take action to slow the process down or stop

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Land O' Lakes from locating in Cass County, and I would urge the adoption of this resolution.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Favorable roll call, please.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All right. Senator Donahue's moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 202. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Now, I'd like to make two announcements before we come to a close. And on the Secretary's Desk, on the Order of Concurrences, are Senate bills that have come back amended. I hope that everybody would remember to file their motions so we can take those up tomorrow or the first part of next week. Also, evidently there's going to be some maintenance done on our top — laptop computers. I wish you would leave them here this evening. Please don't take them out of the building. They're going to be working on them. Resolutions. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 206, offered by Senator Jones and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 207, offered by Senators Donahue and Maitland.

And Senate Joint Resolution 105, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

They're both substantive.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

103rd Legislative Day

May 8, 1996

Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR FAWELL:

For a purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your announcement.

SENATOR FAWELL:

The Senate Transportation Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in A-1. We have about four amendments. We should get out of there pretty quickly if get over there. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Mahar, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purpose of an announcement. The Senate Environment and Energy Committee will be meeting on the Senate Floor at 3:30.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Rauschenberger, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purposes of an announcement. The Senate — the Senate Subcommittee on Bills and Amendments scheduled to meet at 1 o'clock will meet immediately following Session here today, and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Revenues will follow us at 4 o'clock in Room 212.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Mahar moves the Senate stand adjourned till 9 a.m., Thursday, May 9th.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 96/10/07 13:44:24

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 08, 1996

UB-02/16	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
		PAGE	4
	SECOND READING		4
_	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	13
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	14
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1056	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
HB-1249	RECALLED	PAGE	14
HB-1290	THIRD READING	PAGE	15
	THIRD READING	PAGE	21
HB-1645		PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	28
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING		28
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
	SECOND READING	PAGE	. 8
	RECALLED	PAGE	32
HB-2695	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB~2697	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
HB-2697		PAGE	67
	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
UB 2701	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HD-2194	THIRD READING	PAGE	44
		PAGE	8
	SECOND READING		64
•	THIRD READING	PAGE	
HB-2900		PAGE	67
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	65
HB-3141	THIRD READING	PAGE	66
HB-3161	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
HB-3165	THIRD READING	PAGE	-70
HB-3166	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	71
HB-3436	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	72
	RECALLED	PAGE	75
	RECALLED	PAGE	75
		PAGE	79
	THIRD READING		80
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	85
	RECALLED	PAGE	86
	THIRD READING	PAGE	87
HB-3637	THIRD READING	PAGE	88
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	RECALLED	PAGE	89
	ADOPTED	PAGE	97
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	98
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	98
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	98
55N-0105	NEOODOTTON OFFERED		,,

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-PASTOR TED GALL	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002 STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 96/10/07 13:44:24

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 08, 1996

SUBJECT MATTER

PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	2
PAGE	2
PAGE	2
PAGE	63
PAGE	68
PAGE	99
	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE