107 Legislative Day

- January 21, 1992
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The House will come to order. We'll be led in the invocation today by Representative Nelson Rice. Guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Rice: "Good morning, may we bow our heads. Dear Father, we are gathered here once again to deal with the business of this great state. And we know during these trying times we need Your expert guidance, Your direction, and most assuredly, understanding. The people in this state need our best, and we're here today to give that. We ask this humble prayer in Your Son, Jesus', name. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ann Stepan."
- Stepan et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. :Kubik."
- Kubik: "Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. There are no excused absences on the Republican side."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, on this side of the aisle, Representative

 LeFlore is an excused absence."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner, is she here? Mr. Clerk, put Shirley
 Jones on present. Thank you. Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

 117 Members answering a Roll Call, a quorum is present.

 Page 2 of Calendar, Senate Bills Third Reading, appears

 Senate Bill 424. Representative Kubik, you're a Co-Sponsor

 of the Bill. Would you like to handle the Bill? Mr.

 Kubik. Third Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 424, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

107 Legislative Day

January • 21, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

Rubik: "One moment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 424, with Amendment #ll which was adopted last week. Amendment 11 deletes everything and becomes the Bill, and essentially I think we all know what's in this legislation. This will...this is the Governor's proposal to borrow \$500 million in short-term obligation in order to reduce the backlog of medicaid payments owed to the providers in the State of Illinois. This particular Bill encompasses only the borrowing provision. It did not encompass any of the proposed reductions in the budget. So, I will be happy to respond to any questions you might have and would appreciate your support of Senate Bill 424."

Speaker McPike: "There being no discussion. The question is,
'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'.

Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Harris: "Representative, was this Bill not supposed to be part of
a package, both this borrowing and the other reductions
that we are considering here on the House Floor?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "May I answer that question? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the proposal is as follows. Senate Bill 424 has within it now the provision to borrow \$500 million to pay the providers and expedite the payments. What we propose, subject to the Assembly's approval, is that this Bill be passed in its current form, and whoever wants to vote for it can vote for it, whoever want's to vote against it can vote against it. I, personally, am going to vote in favor

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

of it. It would go to the Senate, they would nonconcur in our action. It would come back to us, we would refuse to recede and ask for a Conference Committee. At that point, the Conferees would be appointed, and this would be the Bill that we would discuss the Emergency Budget Act on. In between, or when that is concluded and that work is done and is placed in a Conference Committee, we would then recess for caucus on both sides of the aisle so everybody can be advised of the discussion levels that have taken place up to this point in time, and you can then decide what you want to do on the Emergency Budget Act."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I now have the game plan and I appreciate that very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 'ayes' and 1 'no'. Senate Bill 424, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let the record reflect that Shirley Jones intended to vote 'aye' on the previous Bill. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 119, offered by Representative Harris; Senate Joint Resolution 108, offered by McPike; Senate Joint Resolution 109, by Hicks; Senate Joint Resolution 110, by Klemm; Senate Joint Resolution 111 by Hultgren; and Senate Joint Resolution 114 by Phelps. House Resolutions. House Resolution 1460, by Ronan; 1461 by Curran; 1462 by Curran; 1463 by Curran and 1464 by Representative Curran."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, these are all Agreed Resolutions. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

107 Legislative Day

- January 21, 1992
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman, moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 118, offered by
 Representative Klemm, in respect to the memory of William
 "Bill" Fitzgerald, and House Resolution 465, offered by
 Representative Kirkland, in respect to the memory of Bruce
 C. Lind."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution 92, offered by Representative Phelps, and House Joint Resolution 94, offered by Representative Phelps."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Introduction and First Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2738, offered by Representative Flinn, et-al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2739, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to Amend the Real Estate License Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2740, offered by Representative Parke, et-al, a Bill for an Act in relationship to adopting a highway or public area. First Reading of the Bill. And House Bill 2741, offered by Representative Klemm, Ropp, Deuchler et-al, a Bill for an Act in relationship to adopting a highway or public area. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Page 2 of the Calendar under Conference
 Committee Reports, appears Senate Bill 697. Representative
 Steczo. Mr. Steczo here? Senate Bill 1470, Representative

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

- Wolf."
- Wolf: "Question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Do we have to take the Motion first?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, yes. Mr. Wolf, on Motion, page 4 of the Calendar, a Motion on Senate Bill 1470."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend Rule 79(e) and place Senate Bill 1470 on the Order of Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker McPike: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Mr. Black, this is an Agreed Bill with Mr. Parke. There being no discussion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used on the Gentleman's Motion and the Motion carries. The Bill is now on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now move for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1470."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wolf, if you could explain the Conference Committee Report, briefly."
- Wolf: "I can't hear you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "If you could explain the Conference Committee Report, briefly."
- Wolf: "Yes, this is a Bill to address an agreement that was negotiated between the Illinois Municipal League and the Illinois Municipal Retirement System. It contains just one major benefit provision which, as I say, has been agreed to."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1470?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 103 'ayes' and 8

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1470, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Steczo, Senate Bill 697.

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report or the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 697. This Report amends the Premium Finance Article of the Insurance Code and deletes the requirement that the named insured must personally sign a premium finance agreement, and authorizes the signing of a premium finance agreement on behalf of a named insured. But it also requires that the named insurer has to be informed of the terms and conditions prior to the first premium notice being sent. It also provides that the contract is cancelled, if the contract is cancelled the insurance company must return all unearned premiums due under the contract with the premium finance company within 60 days. I would, Mr. Speaker, move for the adoption of the Report."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Tony Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Young, A.: "Who is authorized to sign the agreement besides the insured under this Conference Committee?"

Steczo: "This Conference Committee Report, Representative Young, says that it authorizes the signing of the...agreement on behalf of a named insured."

Young, A.: "Right, and my question is, who signs on behalf of the named insured?"

Steczo: "Well, if you're talking about a situation where a person makes a phone call to an office, and the agent says, 'Well, because we have this verbal agreement over the telephone, I

107 Legislative Day

- January 21, 1992
- will sign it for you'. However, prior to the first premium being paid, that insurer has to be provided with all the terms and conditions. So..."
- Young, A.: "This in effect authorizes the insurance agent to sign for the insured?"
- Steczo: "It authorizes, could authorize the insurance agent, however, the terms and conditions must be provided, and if there is a cancellation, all the money must be forwarded back to the insured."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Regan: "Representative, if there is any fiddling around with the loan forms and the procedures, without proper notification, is it against the law?"
- Steczo: "The insured must be notified, as I mentioned, of all the terms and conditions. So, if that insured were not, then it would be illegal."
- Regan: "So, indirectly this is a convenience for the customer, as well as the agent, for binding over the phone, coverage that's necessary on a quick time basis, and if there is any fooling around, it's definitely against the law now and it will still be against the law with this Bill?"
- Steczo: "As we do in other situations, where we use the phone and bind contracts and other things, that is correct."
- Regan: "Thank you, I support the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 697?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 111 'ayes' and 3 'nos',

107 Legislative Day

- January 21, 1992
- and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 697, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "The Committee on Rules has met pursuant to Rule 29(c)3. The following Bills have been ruled exempt on January 21, 1992, House Bill 2725."
- Speaker McPike: "Clerk, Supplemental Calendar Announcement."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #1 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik. Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Bill 424."
- Kubik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede from House Amendment 11 and call for the creation of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman's Motion is that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #2, 3, 5, 6 and 11. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's Motion carries. The Gentleman has now asked for the appointment of a Conference Committee. Conference Committee will be appointed. Mr. Black, are the Republicans ready for a caucus? The House will now stand in recess until the hour of 2.00 p.m. There will be a Republican Caucus in Room 118 immediately and there will be a Democratic Caucus in Room 114 immediately. We'll go back in Session at 2:00 p.m. The House now stands in recess."
- Speaker Giglio: "Members of the Assembly, the budget bill has just come out of the LRB. It's going to have to be proof read for the next half hour or 45 minutes. It's going to take a couple hours to complete the entire process. So be at ease until 5:30. The House stands in recess until

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

5:30."

- Clerk Leone: "Could I have your attention? The Speaker has asked that Members please return to the chamber, we'll begin Session in about 5 minutes, 5 or 10 minutes."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The House will come to order. On page 3 of the Calendar under Motions.

 Under Motions appears House Bill 185, a Motion by McPike-Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi on the Motion. Page 3 of the Calendar."
 - Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 79(c) and place on the Order of nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 511."
 - Speaker McPike: "Alright, you heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Yes, Representative Matijevich."
 - Matijevich: "He said...the board said 185 and he had another Bill..."
 - Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi..."
 - Matijevich: "I hope he made a mistake and not the board."
 - Speaker McPike: "No, the board is correct. Representative Giorgi's Motion was on House Bill 185, to suspend. Pursuant to Rule 74(a)l to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(c) that Motion carries with the use of the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Wolf, a Motion on House Bill 969."
 - Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take House Bill 969 from the table suspend Rule 79(c), and place on the Order of concurrence."
 - Speaker McPike: "79(e). You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Being no discussion the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Senate Bill 133, Representative Hicks, on a Motion. Mr. Hicks, on a Motion. page 4 of the

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Calendar, Senate Bill 133."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports."

Speaker McPike: "You've heard the Gentlemen's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Senate Bill 923, Representative Currie on a Motion, page 4. Page 4 of the regular Calendar."

Currie: "Do I need to take it from the table, or is it all ready?"

Speaker McPike: "Page 4 of the regular Calendar."

Currie: "Right, is it a Motion to take from the table that I need to call?"

McPike: "The Lady moves to suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "On that, Mr. Black."

Black: "Just an inquiry of the Chair. To suspend this Rule on this particular Bill, would this require 71 votes?"

Speaker McPike: "It takes 60 votes, Mr. Black."

Black: "Under 79(e)?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "So the Chair has ruled it would take 60 votes?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "May I then direct a question of the Sponsor before you act on her Motion?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, is there something in this Bill about CFC's that we have visited once before?"

Currie: "There is language in the Bill that would bring us into compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act, and those

1838 80

.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

provisions have the support of the Illinois Retail
Merchants Association and the Illinois Manufacturers
Association."

Black: "Was this...was this Bill defeated once before?"

Currie: "I believe that there was something similar that failed in the House although it passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. As I say, the provisions in this Conference Committee Report had the full support of the Illinois Manufacturers Association, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. I am aware of no opposition to these provisions by any one in the Illinois business community."

Black: "Well, I thank you very much. I know of some opposition.

I object to the Lady's Motion, and would ask for a Roll
Call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Motion pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. All voted?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 70 'ayes' and 46 'nos' and the Motion carries. House Resolution 1467, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to by-pass the Rules Committee use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose, to adopt immediate consideration, adoption of House Resolution 1467. This is agreed on both sides of the aisle, it would amend the rules so that we would move up the introduction and consideration in committee, of the House Appropriation Bills, to conform with the later introduction of Appropriation Bills because of the Governor's latter budget message. I would know ask leave of the House and use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Is there any discussion? There being none the Attendance Roll will be used, and the Motion carries. And on the Resolution, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I have explained the Resolution and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is...Mr. Black, on the adoption of House Resolution 1467."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record.

John, this is the Resolution that you have cleared with our side of the aisle and it simply puts dates for Approp Bills in synch with what the Governor is asking us to do later on about his delayed budget message? Nothing else in there at all?

Matijevich: "Nothing else."

Black: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1467 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution adopted. The Resolution is adopted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. On Supplemental #3 appears Senate Bill 133, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 133 is exactly what we passed last week. Actually it remove everything out of the vehicle Bill and does a number of things, as people have the synopsis right in front of them...basically, four different things. Employment Security is \$2.1 million in federal it will be a federal transfer. Arts Council \$160 thousand, Commerce and Community Affairs and \$3 million is all federal money. Every bit of this is federal money and its a transfer. I'd be happy to try and answer any specific questions on it."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

It is all federal moneys that we are allowing the

Appropriations to use, and I would ask all to support it."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 133?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 116 'ayes' and no 'navs'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to And this Bill, having received a Senate Bill 133. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Balthis. Let the record reflect that the Gentleman would have voted 'aye' on Senate Bill 133. the Order of Concurrence on Supplemental #4, appears House Bill 969. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 969. Senate Amendment #1 now becomes the Bill, and it's the result of an agreement between the City of Chicago and the Chicago Fire and the Chicago Police. What it does is that it raises the minimum for annuitants and the widow's benefits. It raises the annuitants and benefits increases from 475 to 650 a month and the widows from 400 to 500. I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 969."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Parke."

Parke: "Yes, will the ... "

Speaker Giglio: "Giglio in the Chair."

Parke: "Will the Sponsor of the Bill take a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Parke: "Representative Wolf, is it my understanding that this
Bill has been signed off by both sides and this only
applies to the City of Chicago?"

Wolf: "That is correct, Representative."

- Parke: "Do you have any idea how much this is going to cost to the property taxpayers of the City of Chicago?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Wolf, they're going to take this Bill out of the record for a minute. Supplemental Calendar #2 appears Senate Bill 424."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. Senate Bill 424. Conference Committee Report, Supplemental #2. Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 424 appears before you today to implement the 1992 Emergency Budget Act components. forth additional reductions, and I 'reductions in state spending', of \$257 million. set up the transfers of some funds, without a tax increase, in order to address some very difficult times that we have right now. I don't need to tell anyone in this chamber that we are facing and are going through a national recession, in some of our eyes unparalleled in our own personal experiences. We now, in this state, face a revenue shortfall, and all of you are aware, and many of you know because you have participated with me, in a federal level, in working and trying to work with Congress to try to get them to stop mandating such things as additional medicaid expenses where we are required to pick-up the balance of the action that they take. That we are not alone in this problem in Illinois, but it is facts, spread throughout the United State in many states. In some states, more than 30 states across this country are in more

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

dire straits than we are. Some states, such as California, face a budget shortfall in the billions of dollars. states, such as New York, are estimated to have a shortfall ranging anywhere from 1 billion to 4 billion additional dollars after going through cuts of last year. you're facing right now is not unique just to Illinois, but truly is unique to us in terms of our governmental experience in service, and many of us through our active life times, in our adult life. So, we are faced with some very hard and difficult decisions, and in my opinion we are fortunately led in this state by a Governor who understands what the people of this state are asking us to do. asked...The people of Illinois are, in fact, asking us make the hard decisions, to make the tough choices, and to face up to the spending and living within our means without a tax increase. And yes, the Governor, in understanding that, has presented to you his alternatives. And, as you know, when we started this process, he initially came forth with a budget reduction plan in excess of \$287 million, supplemented later which would bring us to \$350 million in cuts. As a result of some of the discussions, and lengthy at many times, and two public hearings, one in Chicago and one in Springfield, by all the agency directors which appeared before you, where you were able to ask and have questions answered, we have now fashioned, truly what one might call, a compromise. This is not a compromise built on a future tax increase. This is not a compromise as we have done so many times in the past in the 80's, responded to budget problems by increasing taxes, whether on temporary, which so many times turned in to be permanent, or on a basis in which we have said, we'll slip in a little tax here, 'we'll slip in a little tax there'. This is,

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

compromise that has fact. а been fashioned by the Legislative Leader7, and what we call. the budgeteers. those people that are responsible for chairing and running the budget committees of the House and Senate along with respected staffs and many of you throughout the process. That, indeed, addresses what the people of Illinois are asking us to do and that is, live within our means. The only answer to the problem today, and the only answer to the problem tomorrow is, in fact, to cut spending and to reduce our appropriations to live within our means. These additional spending cuts that are before you right now, did not come easy. We had many, many series of hours and lengthy discussions and weekends of difficult decisions to make. And I know some of you sit there right now, you may say, there is a little part of this Bill, a little section that concerns me because it involves my district. It is a project that I wanted, that I cared about, and a project that I want to save because I've worked so hard. And boy, I tell you, I can understand that, and I can relate to that, because you are an elected Representative from your area charged with responsibility of representing that area. But I ask you to the whole. I ask you to look at the product that is before you now. And the product before you now gives you the ability to go home and say, 'yes, we addressed the needed spending of this state, and we did everything we could to protect those people that need our services the most'. And I heard at the very start, when we started this whole level of discussion, every Legislator said, 'a primary concern to us is education. We must invest dollars in taking care of our childrens' future'. And, boy, your call was heard on the Democrat side and on the Republican

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

side. And what did we do? We saved, the best we could, education funding in this state, and yes, we did only cut the school aid formula by a slight amount, a little over \$9 And that's a response directly to the concerns that were leveled at our hearings and as a result of the negotiations. And, yes, some of you, that in your legislative career have highlighted the area of Public Aid and spoken so loudly and clearly for the needy and the people that need our attention as a government, spoke loudly on AFDC, and the bulk of that was restored as a result of the cries from both sides of the aisle. And the aid to the blind and the needy was restored as a result of the cries from both sides of the aisle, and, yes, led by Senator Rock when he asked that that be restored because of his commitment to the blind and the disabled. And in the area of Mental Health, restorations came in the reserved beds fund as well as community grants. And the list goes on and on and on because, truly, this budget was reviewed with a great deal of depth. Now, I could tell you that I stand before you as the principal Sponsor of Senate Bill 424, and I wish it could be different. I wish that our economy had come back like we had hoped. I wish that there was a voice in Washington that could walk into the Congress of the United States; That could talk to our leaders and the Federal Government and say, 'Do you understand what you're doing to the states? Do you recognize that whenever you pass another mandate and requirement on medicaid, that you're forcing bankruptcy upon the states of this country and we are not able to respond? And yet, you send out your press releases and what you say is, we've responded to those people that need our help in the Federal Government'. I wish that there was that voice, but it seems that every

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

say that to Washington, it falls on deaf ears. That they won't listen. But there was a voice that went to Washington and fought for us in the Medicaid Assessment Plan after we acted in July, and you remember that voice because he worked with some of you, and the man's name Governor Jim Edgar, who brought back millions of dollars in the Medicaid Assessment Plan to help get us through this problem. Now, I will tell you, the task is not easy. know that this Bill contains a provision that delays the budget presentation to April 7, 1992. And I understand why the Governor has asked us to do that. He's asked us to do that because he needs more time to restructure, to respond to the sagging economy, and to make sure that the people of Illinois are carefully considered from all parts of This agreement, in fact, is geographically balanced. This agreement, yes, contains a provision that allow the Chicago School Finance Authority to reduce its reserves. That does allow access to that money. So, yes, although there are some cries that reform of education in Chicago is not brought about as a result of this agreement but does respond to the fact that \$13.2 million will be available to offset cuts in moneys that would go to Chicago, so Chicago children can be taken care of. At the same time, some of my downstaters say, 'how come'? 'How come we didn't do the same thing for downstate?' Well, I have an answer for that. I'm not real happy with answer, but it is their money. It is their money that they have reserved. Now the other side of that coin is, we are fearful on this side of the aisle that bankruptcy will occur in the Chicago School System and they will come back and say to us, 'now you have to bail us out of our misgivings and our own problem because we haven't handled

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

our own dollars efficiently'. And I'd say to you, make no There is not a tax increase in the mistake about it. future under this Governor. He intends to hold the line on spending and intends to have this state live within its means, and that goes for the Chicago system of education just as it does in every part of this state. I say to you, when I look at this budget agreement, when we transfer special funds into General Revenue Fund, that I'm concerned about that because we're taking some excess funds, yet everyone was carefully reviewed to make sure that we didn't unfairly burden them or hamper them in the chores that they have in front of you, that that's \$35 million. Ι don't like the suspension of 1.7% sales tax diversion in the road fund for five months, suggested by somebody on the other side of the aisle from me. But I agreed to it, because I knew it was necessary to get the budget agreement done. And yes, we do refinance some bonds which will bring us \$13 million, and we set up some special fund agency reductions, and we delay some of the SKIP bonds in our presentation of those. All in all, after everything is said and done, this is, in fact, a \$350 million package. I pray, and I hope that it is a package that will work. A package that will allow us time in which to restructure the spending of this Government. Time for all of us, in a bipartisan fashion in the truest sense, to meet our responsibilities Legislators in this state. Time for us to say, that we understand what people are asking us to do. Time to prove that we are a compassionate and caring General Assembly and a compassionate and caring government and a compassionate and caring and understanding state that meets the needs of people of Illinois. I recommend passage of this. recommend it to you with some trepidation because not all

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

the provisions in here are provisions that I agree with or particularly like. But I understand that this is a negotiation that stopped the tax increase; that heeded the advice and cries of people from all over the State of Illinois; is in fact, geographically balanced; and yet, saved education funding in the best manner we can; and restored many of our Public Aid cuts. That's what the Governor of this state has done for you. That's what your Legislative Leaders are recommending to you. And I ask you to work with us for a future in Illinois. For bringing back this economy in the best fashion we can and living within our means. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion. Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to Bill. I just heard the Minority Speaker talk about special projects in their districts. Well, I have special projects in my district and those are senior citizens, human beings; disabled, blind people. Those are special children. projects which I fight for, and everyone here should also stand up and fight for. We talk about a geographically balanced Bill. Yes, it is geographically balanced on the children, on the senior citizens, on education, on the poor, and on the needy. Illinois, the unemployment rate in Illinois right now is 9.3%, 2% higher than the national average. And yet, when people need the most, government turns its back on them. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a catastrophe here in this state. We have a disaster, and that disaster is hurting the poor people of the State of Illinois. Once again the poor, the needy. senior citizens, students, the children. sick, the indigent, are being bushwhacked at the federal level

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

the state level. ramroded at Why? Because these are defenseless people. These are people that do not have the means to fight back. That's why they elected us, to stand up for them and to vote for this will be a big and grave But, you do whatever you want to do. I know that I'm going to stand up for the poor, and the people, and the needy in this state. We have...If this Bill passes tonight, 90 about 95 to 100 thousand Chicagoans which depend on General Assistance will see their checks or their grants cut by \$11 or \$15. Maybe for you and for me, \$15 a month is nothing. But for the needy, those individuals that do not have any other alternative, any other resource, this is a matter of life and death. This is a matter of whether eating one day or not eating the next day. But we must look at this and look at it seriously. We're hurting people by passing this Bill tonight. We're going to see hundreds of senior citizens that depend on the Home Care They're not going to receive those services. They're going to have to stand in line like they do in the Soviet Union, and this is the example that we're giving the people in the State of Illinois. Longer lines for longer services. Services in Public Aid offices, people are going to stand up days in lines. Why and Why? Because, the State of Illinois is turning its back on its people, and it's about time that the Governor, the administration at the local and the federal level and the state level, open up their arms, open up their hearts, and take care of people that really need it. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm opposed to this Bill because it sets back ten years of progress that we have made in this House in moving people towards gainful,

107 Legislative Day

January · 21, 1992

private employment. This Bill would give the Governor the right to take away \$2 1/2 million which has been placed in the budget for Project Chance. It will give the Governor and the State of Illinois the authority not to receive some \$4 million worth of Federal Funds that would come in to make people gainfully employed. I don't think that we have a moral right to do that. I don't think that we have a moral right to take the people in this state who are receiving dialysis, who are cancer patients, who are diabetic patients, and who depend upon community care. I don't think that we have a right to take those 2,000 cases and not continue to give the community care. These are cuts which have been proposed to the Department of Aging budget and I think that it would be to disavow a responsibility to the sick, for us to do this. We, back in July, cut, drastically cut, the General Assistant budget but we did so under the theory that what we would do is to help assess, train and place General Assistance recipients in jobs. The effect of this Bill will be to take away all of those programs. And I think it is morally irresponsible do so at this time. This Bill would take away child care. Child care for recipients of Public Aid who are trying to move from Public Aid to private employment. How could we do this? How can we do this to the people who are depending upon us? I think that the Bill represents a big The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, three months ago, had \$93 million. It spent down and obligated this money down to \$13 million and now under this budget is having a very, very small cut after obligating, under a rock, all of its programs. We should not condone that by voting for this Bill. We should turn that down because it is not morally responsible. I'm asking you to

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

. :

not make these cuts, because I think it is immoral and irresponsible. I think that we ought to continue on the track of trying to help those that are moving from poverty and moving from state assistance to private employment. We've made some remarkable progress in that, and I think that we should not give up that progress right before President Bush is to announce what his jobs program is. I think that we have a duty to hold to the course a little bit longer until we can see what assistance we can get from the Federal Government, of what other cuts might be possible, rather than acting in a very uncivilized way of attacking the very weakest of our society. That is what we do when we do what is proposed here. I think for these reasons, this is a very bad Bill, and our course is to send it back to Conference Committee by voting 'no' so that there can be more reasonable responses."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor answer two questions?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Yes."

Schakowsky: "Thank you. The Department on Aging Budget which is being reduced \$1.8 million and 1.3 coming from the Community Care Program which provides care for the frail elderly in their homes and adult day care. Earlier this month, JCAR rejected the Department on Aging emergency rules which cut Community Care Program. My question is, I want to make sure that the current budget reduction in the Department of Aging of \$1.8 million is the full cut that the Department of Aging will see this...this fiscal year. Is this the total cut or is there going to be some effort to enforce the emergency rule cut?"

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Ryder: "Representative, it is my understanding that currently within this Bill is the ability of the departments, themselves, to enforce by emergency rule, those cuts which are contemplated within the Bill itself. And, I believe that you should know, so that we all are dealing honestly with the Bill itself, that the amount of cuts are specified within the Bill itself. There are previous attempts through, emergency rules, to do other items. I am not at this juncture to be able to guarantee to you that they may not be reconsidered. In fact, I think that all agencies will do their best to reconsider all the rules that have been proposed, including the emergency rules that will be necessary to effectuate this Act."

Schakowsky: "One other question. Do you know, if when this Act expires, the 2,000 grandfathered status clients will be reinstated?"

Ryder: "I can't tell you, specifically. It's my understanding that after this Bill goes out of effect, the majority of it that goes out of effect on July...June 30th or July 1st. I think it's July 1st. When the majority of those provisions go out of effect, we will be dealing with the next years budget, the fiscal 1993 budget. My understanding is that there will not be grandfathering, and therefore, those people would not be reconsidered. But I believe that that is an issue for us to deal with when we're dealing with the FY '93 budget, as we will be soon doing within the next 60 days."

Schakowsky: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm in opposition to this deal, the raw end of which has been dealt to those who are already the victims of this recession and the economic policies of the last decade.

I'm speaking of the poor and the middle class. I refuse to

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

accept, as the only alternative, the Governor's demagogic pledge of no new taxes, as if all taxes are equal and all taxpayers are equal. We need more revenue, and we shouldn't be going to our school children to get it. When class sizes increase and textbooks aren't available, when special education and bilingual programs are cut, will our . constituents be thanking us? When local property taxes increase to take up the slack, will taxpayers be happy then? When young people can't afford tuition to their own state colleges and universities, will they be grateful? And when we need more money, does it make sense to go to those who have the least? I don't know how anyone can cast a vote to take \$11 a month from someone whose total income is \$165. Twenty-two people have died from exposure already this winter in the Chicago area. How many more will die on the streets because of what we do here today. Aside from the human tragedies, some of these cuts are iust plain stupid, because they will cost the state more money. Cuts in homecare for the frail elderly and the mentally and physically handicapped will increase hospital and nursing home admissions. Cuts in drug treatment programs will increase crime in the pressure on our already overcrowded prison system. There are alternatives. revenue, and we should get it from the people who can afford to pay. The Governor knows this deal is not the There just isn't enough money in it. The sooner we get on with the business of developing real solutions like looking at our unfair tax system, the sooner we'll solve this crisis and avoid the one we will surely be facing next month and the month after and the month after. 'I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of A budget, as we all know, is no more than an estimate. It is no more than a projection of what expect to take in and what we expect to spend. And through process that we call the General Assembly, establish a budget every year. But through no fault of our own, our estimates, our projections, did not meet what expected on the revenue side. Can we control that? No. Certainly not entirely. We are subject to forces beyond what we can control. So, what we're saying here is revenue did not come in the way we expected it to come in. What do we do? We have to reduce spending expectations also. are those of you in the House who feel that we're picking on the neediest; we're picking on those who can afford it, and you know that's not necessarily true. We recognize that government is not just a bottom line Government really is here to help people. business. has a function to help those who cannot help themselves. Spending reductions are difficult, but let's put something in perspective. Our revenues for FY '92 are still higher than our revenues for FY '91. In other words, for this year we are going to take in more money than we did last Ιt just so happens it's not as much as we expected when we drew up the budget, five months ago. are going to be higher, our spending from FY '91 to FY '92 is also going to be higher, but it's not going to be able to be as high as we initially projected. The agreement in front of you was reached in a bipartisan manner. It is a basic, good agreement. I doubt that anyone in this chamber likes all that is in this Bill. is not easy for any of us to take. But, nonetheless, think it's a fair and equitable agreement and deserves our

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of Maybe I have a 19th century view of government, but it seems to me, when you've got to make cuts, you cut those things that are not as important. What we have done here is, we have said, 'Well, the poor are not that important. We're going to cut the poor. We cut them in the spring, we're going to cut them again'. But it seems to me we set up government in the first place to provide a basic safety net for those who can't take care of themselves. the spring, we cut General Assistance to 9 months, and 6 months for next year, and we cut the pharmaceutical program for senior citizens. We put an \$800 cap. And we already seen the effect of those and other cuts. We have senior citizens today who have used up their diabetics who cannot get drugs. We have people on General Assistance who are into the last 3 months of the 9 months. But we've decided, in this legislation that that's not enough; that it's more important to take care of the business community or other kinds of individuals than to provide that basic safety net to those individuals who are bottom of the ladder, who can least take care of themselves. So, what we're saying here is, let's not only cut General Assistance to 9 months, but in the 9 months - 6 months next year, they're going to get...let's cut the amount they get. Let's cut it from \$165 to \$154, and let's cut if for families also. I'm sorry, that's not my idea of what government should be doing. Maybe I have a 19th century view of government, but I think if we need to make cuts, and we clearly do, they ought to be made elsewhere than those who can least afford them. I urge a 'no' vote.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

I would point out, as well. We are cutting...We are making a number of cuts that make no sense. They will not this state a single dime. We're cutting refugee assistance This is a 100% federal program. Where are we going to save one dime by cutting the amount we pay the I don't understand it. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me. We're cutting education. We cut it to the bone last year. We're cutting the ability of recipients to get some education, to go on in school so they can get off the roles. I don't understand what we're doing to the public schools. I don't understand what we're doing to the welfare recipients. I don't understand what we're doing to the senior citizens here. The priorities are all wrong. I don't think...If we're going to pass this kind of legislation, I wonder very seriously why we need any government; why we need any budget at all. have clearly missed the mark in terms οf what our responsibilities are. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Last July, I joined with many of you in voting for Senate Bill 45, which made a over billion dollar adjustment in the operation of state government. And I told people at that time and told the people back in my district that I didn't really believe that even those cuts would balance the state budget. But the Governor should be given the opportunity to put forth his budget, and in 6 months, if it worked, we'd know it, and if it didn't work, well, we would know that too. I think we can see where the Governor's budget has not worked, has not lived up to his promises. I think this \$350 million adjustment, about \$260 million in cuts is a piecemeal approach to the state's

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

What is the budget going to be like next year in FY '93? There are over \$500 million of one-time revenue increases in flim-flam budgetry in this year's budget that we will not have available to us in next year's This Governor, in this piece of legislation, has chosen to delay his FY '93 budget message by over 30 days. That: is the first time in over 20 years that a Governor, since we've had our Constitution, has chosen to delay giving a budget message. I'm perplexed in that this Governor has spent over 20 years in state government, he's been a State Representative. He's been a Constitutional Officer for the last decade. He has been a 'Governor want-to-be', for the last 5 or 6 years, commenting on every facet of state government. Why doesn't he know what we need to be doing to bring our fiscal house in order? After all, during the he claimed that he wanted a two year last campaign. budget-cycle, and yet, he is unable to get through even one budget-cycle without major, major revisions. I was looking at the New York Times this morning, and I may have what his problem is. You know, he's really faced with a dichotomy, with a anomaly. He is also, besides being the Governor of our state, the Chairman of President Bush's re-election committee in the State of Illinois. Yes, he is. Yes. Yes. Yes, he is. And in the New York Times' today, headlines, 'Bush Aides divided on how to correct slip in popularity. Administration officials debate whether problem is policy or poor communication.' And President Bush's budget chief has convinced the President that it poor communication, a matter of communication. Right, a matter of communication. Well, maybe the chairman of Bush's re-electing campaign would want to communicate to our President, that we are facing a fiscal crisis in this

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

state because of the Reagan-Bush policies imposed on the states. And I would suggest that, if he has a split personality here, having to defend the President saying that the problem is communication, and then having to put on his hat as Governor and saying, 'Gee, I can't decide what kind of cuts I want to make and where this budget is going to be going...I don't know, maybe it's the economy, I can't figure it out.' Maybe what he ought to do is resign as Chairman of Bush's state re-election campaign and devote full time to the Illinois budget, and make his budget address on March 4, just like every other Governor has had to do."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to Curran: Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard why this...these budget cuts are foolish and that we are cutting community care programs. We have heard why these budget cuts are heartless, and we've heard why they are pointless. Let me tell you one thing that I think most of us do not know, are not aware of, and probably don't realize what an imposition that we are putting on state employees. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know how many of you are aware that we are already \$135 million projected shortfall this year for state employees group insurance. With the existing budget, that we are doing nothing to fix by this charade, we're \$135 million short for state employees' group insurance. What this particular budget cut does is, it adds to that problem, making it no longer just a \$135 million shortfall. it will make it now. a \$150 million shortfall. Let me give you the picture. State employees are working without a raise this year, for this entire fiscal year. State employees are accepting

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

worse group insurance. State employees are being asked to pay a portion of that group insurance, and now when they go make a claim on their group insurance, for which they are paying, we are not paying those claims. We're already \$25 million short. We projected to be \$135 million short, with this measure, it's going to be \$150 million short for state employees' group insurance. Who do you think government is? Are you operating under some misapprehension that it is us and those people over in the Senate a total of 177 people? It is 70,000 state employees, and it is those 70,000 state employees all across this state, whose job it is to carry out our wishes. To do the things that we command them to do by the that we pass here. It is those people that we are shorting million in their state group insurance. absolutely unconscionable. Nobody has been talking about this, but it leaves us \$150 million short. It is totally irresponsible. Nothing that the Governor plans to do in this particular budget charade, does anything for state employees' group insurance. And I ask you on that alone, to please vote 'no'. It's the only responsible vote."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ropp. Briefly."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I want to give due credit to the four leaders and to the Governor for the extensive efforts that they have worked out in coming up with this compromised piece of legislation. I don't think any of us are pleased to take money away from education, because I think all of us feel that that is the real core to solving many of our social ills. But the situation is, that when we don't have the income that we think we should have received, because of any number of

107 Legislative Day

January · 21, 1992

effects, we have to take strong courageous measures. Someone has said, tough times never last but tough people do, and, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Body, we've got to become tough at this time and make these kind of decisions so that we can live within the means of our financial ability here in the State of Illinois. If you go home a number of people, they're asking us government is growing too big. We clearly see that in Congress in Washington and truly this should not happen in the State of Illinois. We have a Governor now, once and for all, that is willing to say, we've got to stay within our means and that means reducing the size of government. I don't like to see programs being taken from...funds taken out of the road program, but I do like to see the state borrowing some money to pay for the medicaid payments that we owe to nursing homes, to pharmacies, to long facilities, and so on. This is being responsible, and that's what this piece of legislation does. A lot of people say, well, we've got a lot of people out of work and this is a bad time. Let me tell ya, the Daily Pantagraph, in my district, had two-and-a-half pages last Sunday of Help Wanted ads, and I dare say, that if anybody really wants a job, they can find one. It's not easy to vote for a piece of legislation that may hurt some people. saying that we need to be tough in this kind of situation. Make the courageous vote so that we can move on and government in step with what the people of our respective districts need. And I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black. The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of legislative intent, I would like to ask Representative Ryder to respond to two questions."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Black: "Representative Ryder, can you explain to me the purpose of the Bill's language which validates certain fund transfers?"

"There's several sections in the Bill which validate the transfers that were previously made under Senate Bill 45, which is Public Act 87-14. Under that Senate Bill 45, Governor attempted to transfer 21 million of unclaimed property funds, and as you know, the legality of that transfer is currently being litigated. In addition, another 21 million in other funds were actually transferred by the Governor. The General Assembly have reviewed these transfers and agree that there was, in fact, an excess of moneys in these funds on June 30, 1991, the date of the transfer. Rather than the prior delegation of authority to the Governor, this Bill makes explicit legislative funding. that these excess funds existed and authorizes the transfers.",

Black: "Thank you, very much. Are there also new fund transfers authorized in addition to the transfers made last summer under Senate Bill 45?"

Ryder: "Yes. We have reviewed the balances in the hundreds of special funds and have determined which of these funds have an excess of moneys that are not needed to support the programs authorized by the special funds. The Bills, this Bill, lists the expressed amounts of excessive funds in 39 of the special funds that, in our judgement, are most appropriate for transfer and orders these amounts transferred into the General Revenue Fund."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan. Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

House. You've heard me say this before, and I'll say it one more time. I didn't plan to speak, but a person said had a lot of 'job wanted' ads in his community. First of all, we can't afford to live in his community. Secondly, if we did live in his community we'd have to work Diamond-Star, a Japanese auto plant. President, last week or two-weeks ago, I'm going to say it plainly, got on his knees and begged like a car salesman, and not like a President. And begged for the Japanese to buy cars from us. And as you heard on the paper in the news yesterday, the Japanese said to us, Americans, that we were lazy. That we couldn't produce. And we can't read. But then, we're suppose to look in the 'job wanted' ads and move to a particular person's district. The Governor has campaigned and has said that he would not break his promise of raising your income tax, state taxes. Well, I surmise, Mr. Governor, that when you put your left hand on that Bible and raised your right hand and took the Oath of Office, you were taking an oath to a higher Being than anyone in this General Assembly. You've taken an Oath of Office that you've broken to a man or women upstairs, whether you believe He's a man or woman. No, the person upstairs, I ain't talking about upstairs. I'm talking about the real upstairs. The real upstairs. There's an upstairs and a downstairs and there's a real upstairs, Representative Barnes. And he broke that oath. So, he can go around here saying he didn't break a campaign promise, but he broke the promise when he put his left hand on the Bible and raised his right hand and said, I will serve the people of the State of Illinois regardless of what it would take to serve those people. So, everyone is saying, yeah, we're making tough choices and those who are

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

tough left. The tough choice would be to save the people of the State of Illinois. That's the tough choice. is an easy choice, to vote to cut. That's easy. But to stand and fight for those who can't fight for themselves, that's the hard part. So, yes, Mr. say we must bite the bullet. I'll bit the bullet when . you go out there with the homeless and bite that with no heat without them. I'll bite the bullet when you bite the bullet with those who can't read. And i f can't read they can't get a job. I'll bit the bullet with those who are on drugs, which you cut drug programs for those who want to get off drugs and get treatment. So what's going to happen to those people who are on drugs? they going to do? What are They are going to stay on drugs. As long as they are on drugs, what are they going In my community at least, they're gonna knock people up the side of the head and take their money. lastly, to those in the African-American community, we let a person come into our community and sell us a bill of :bad goods. remember two years ago, he was in my district passing around hundreds of thousands of dollars of literacy money to get support from certain people in my community. And what has he done to those same people who voted for him in the African-American community? Where are those people in the African-American community that brought him into my community? I haven't heard one word from them saying, Governor, go a little lax on some of those cuts because you remember, it was some of us that voted for you, and it was some of those that didn't vote is the reason that you're on that second floor. So, yes, we can spread the blame on the Governor. We could spread the blame on 177 Members of the General Assembly. But there is a lot of people out there

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

that are going to be end up hurting. You should have thought about when you went in that polling booth and pulled that lever, or didn't pull that lever. On March 17th, we've got a chance to make amends. Come out and vote. Send George Bush a message that we won't tolerate this any longer. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. I've listened with great interest to the debate concerning this Bill. Naturally, I listened with great interest to some of the remarks which came from the other side of the aisle. Before I respond to some of what I heard, let me point out, as others have pointed out, we are only mid-way through the budget. The date on this Conference Report is January 21, and you'll recall that it was around July 17 or July 18 that we finalized the first consideration of this budget. And now it's close to 6 months later and we're doing a major downward revision to the budget, and of course, there are no solid promises emanating from the administration as to what the future holds. There were some rather positive statements from the administration two to two and a half months ago, but those statements have seemed to evaporate into the woodwork. And so today my estimation is that we will do a significant downward revision of the budget. Speaking for myself, I hold no promises as to what might happen in May June concerning this very budget. And let us recall that there was a budget message that accompanied the budget. We all gathered here one day last March, the Governor of our state stood up on the podium, and he delivered a budget message. And I have some pertinent quotes from that budget message. The Governor said, 'And this is a budget that

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

balanced by fiscal sleight-of-hand nor is it balanced with cash flow gimmicks.' Another quote from our Governor: 'Illinois has fared better than other states in this economic recession. Our revenues have held steady, and nationally, the effects of the downturn are expected to be short-lived.' Did any of you happen to see the news accounts from Chicago? Just the other day, a new hotel opening. Notice was given that applications would be taken. Thousands of people stood in the cold, overnight, file an application to clean a hotel room or to wash dishes. So that's the short-lived recession that they spoke of last March when the budget message was delivered. Now our Governor said that he wouldn't deal in cash-flow gimmicks, he wouldn't use fiscal sleight-of-hand. refresh your memory and let me point your attention to some items that are in this Bill. So, in July we provided in Senate Bill 45, that the Governor would have the authority to transfer \$50 million from special state funds to the General Revenue Fund. There was no provision in that Bill for any kind of payback. Now that, to me, sounds like a loan. Maybe it'll be paid back, maybe it won't. There's no guarantee that it'll be paid back. Tonight, in this Bill, again we give the Governor similar authority as contained in Senate Bill 45. Now we allow the transfer of \$35 million. Again, no automatic payback provision. Let me remind you that in July we deferred a school We simply said that we changed the law, and that payment. one of the school aid payments would be pushed back the next fiscal year. Now that was only \$175 million of what I would refer to as fiscal sleight-of-hand. But will recall in March our Governor said, 'Not this Governor, I'm not going to engage in fiscal sleight-of-hand. I'm

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

going to be a true, blue guy. I wouldn't do anything Well. it's right in this Bill. For those of you who are chomping at the bit to vote for this Bill, it's in and please remember it as you vote for the Bill. I heard a lot of comments about medicaid mandates from this place called Washington D.C.. And I heard rhetoric about no tax increases. no tax increases. For those vou who have forgotten, the national administration has been led by a person named Reagan and a person named Bush. Last time Ι checked, they're Republicans. Now, I know there's a line of rhetoric that savs. 'Oh. the Congress has been controlled by Democrats for 40 years, and the real true believers in this country can't accomplish anything out there because these mean-spirited Democrats control the Congress.' time I read the Federal Constitution...the last time I read the Federal Constitution, the President of the United States has a great deal of power and authority. And if wanted to work his will on the Congress...if he wanted to work his will on the Congress rather than engage in drugs and arms deals...rather than engage in drugs and arms deals, maybe we wouldn't have so many medicaid mandates to concerned about. And then there's these increases. We're against tax increases, but something called the Medicaid Assessment Plan. Assessment Plan. Many of us voted for it. That's That is a tax put on an institution called the hospital and passed along to you and I as users of the hospital. is a tax. I've been questioned by the media for several 'Mr. Speaker, who's winning, who's losing? Did you weeks, win? Did the Governor win?' My response has been are no winners in this process. There are no winners, but

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

there are losers. The losers are people, who simply stated, cannot defend themselves. All of us in this chamber can defend ourselves, that's why we got here. got here through the American electoral process. competitive process. So if you got here, you can handle But there are a lot of people in our society who cannot defend themselves. They are defenseless. People. who, when they die, their family doesn't even have enough money to bury them. People, who, when they get sick, don't have anywhere to go for medical care. They just don't have any opportunity for medical care. They are defenseless, and they are being hurt by what's happening here today. recognize that the popular will of the majority of this country today, and in this state, is to reduce That's pretty much why this Bill is going to pass tonight. But that begs the question: 'Is it morally right for a society like ours and a government like ours to permit this to continue?' It continues in this state because we have an administration that is rigid. It's dug a whole in the ground and it's not going to come out, and it's going to stay the course. And you're going to see more and more of this, and it's going to get worse and worse. And for those who say, well, things will get better because there will be an economic turnaround, don't hold your breath waiting for the economic turnaround. What we are experiencing in the economy of Illinois and the economy of our nation, case of everything coming home to roost. We lived through about ten years of paper prosperity - a bunch of transactions permitted by a national administration that, not only tolerated the issuance of unnecessary debt, it even encouraged it. And now it's all coming home to roost, and everybody's going to have to pay for that.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Unfortunately, some are less able to defend themselves, some are less able to bare through that than others, and that's why this is a lousy thing to do. It's going to happen. I'm going to vote for it, but it's a lousy thing to do. It's a lousy thing to do. It's a lousy thing to do, and this administration ought to move away from these rigid positions it's adopted. Come into the open and find out what life is like in places outside of the City of Springfield."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee?' Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And I've listened, too, to the debate. sometimes, one would ask the question of the Gentleman that spoke just prior to me, '...actually part of the process that helped negotiate this compromise?' The obviously, 'yes'. He participated in every meeting, and he was there offering his advice and his consensus. The answer is, that truly, the legislative process in this state is now working. The answer is, that when you hear from your providers, and they are crying for help. they're crying for payment because this state has not met its responsibility and because you and me and everyone of us cannot escape responsibility for what's going on today - we have addressed that. And we've addressed it in this Bill with a borrowing plan, which will be paid back shortly, and the usage of \$500 million to pay our DD providers, our hospitals and our nursing homes, that care for people that need our help; that are calling out for this government to act, and act now. And, virtually all of you over this weekend were out in your precincts getting your petitions filled out, I'm not going to speak

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

for all of you, but I know and you know, because one your colleagues on the Democratic side in the Senate said it best, when Senator Jacobs said on the Senate floor, this Bill passed the Senate 37 to 15, he said, 'this Governor is right. He knows what the people are asking no new taxes and to cut spending,' and he went on and then voted for this Bill. Now nobody has stood up at this point and said that this is the answer to all of our budget And anyone that would suggest otherwise just problems. isn't staying in tune with current affairs. But want to start talking about responsibility in Washington, I know a little bit about that, and the last time I checked. one of the most important and critical parts of the budget process was a Democrat Majority in both of the Houses of Congress in the Unites States of America. And I hope that they will respond, like this state is responding, to the federal problems, and I hope they'll do it now. have sought alternatives. Some have said, let's tax and spend some more, our answers to school problems is spending more money. And then they turn around and argue that the middle class are so hampered we'll give them a tax relief because we'll pass more taxes ask them to pay less but somebody will come up and pay more. But we, of course, don't know how we're going to do that. We, those of that support this Bill on both sides of the aisle, that support this Bill and will vote for it today support cuts. Others that don't support this Bill support tax increases. Take it to the campaign, if you will. We propose action. Others that don't support this Bill propose delay. propose cooperation on both sides of the aisle as this compromise has brought out; and others propose political posturing and finger pointing where we propose

107 Legislative Day

January • 21, 1992

responsibility and action now and today. So you can't take credit today or tomorrow for something that you're not going to be part of now. You can't vote against this Bill and tell the people of Illinois that you were against tax increases, as some of you may try to do; or that you really were for cutting spending, but this Bill just didn't do it the right way, even though your leadership on both sides of the aisle have recommended passage of this Bill. can't come up and say that schools are going to suffer because you were unable to address the problems when you know that we restored a great deal of money to it. And you can't say that you didn't address the public aid problems, and you voted against this, but you're unwilling to stand up and say we restored many of the dreadful cuts public aid recipients would have experienced. Yes, there are no winners in this process today, and there are no winners in this process tomorrow. But we, by the action tonight can minimize the losers and can help the people of Illinois help themselves to restore this economy. I ask you to vote 'yes' and support this Bill as the Senate did on a vote of 37 to 15."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 424?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Williams to explain his vote."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote, basically, because of the fact that we've heard from the other side that this Governor knows what people are saying that providers, and things of this nature are going to be taken care of. Well, I had a friend of mine that was a guy, one of my precinct captains was the guy on television, Charlie...who stood out there all night. He's not a

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

He's a providee. He's one of those people that provider. I don't think this Governor knows what they're speaking of, and quite frankly, I don't think this Body cares about. represent a poor district. I would, in fact, vote to increase revenues because of the fact that you can't continue to ask people to just accept nothing when there's nothing already. You can't eat air. You can't sleep boxes forever when it's 30 below zero. You can't continue on a path that says we have no heart. You told Chicago schools, you can't use sleight of hands. But the State of Illinois can do it whenever they get ready. Everything this Body does, lately has been extremely hypocritical, and it's been against the basic common poor in this city, state and nation. I'm really sorry that this Governor is so entrenched in his concepts of right and wrong, good and bad, that he no longer understands people are not all in the same position that he is in...as Charles, Mr. Morrow stated to my community and convinced people that he was going to make a change that was going to better the lives of people in our area. And since that time, he's turned his back on them, he's closed the door. He said, 'We don't care about what you have to say. I made a promise, and I'll keep that promise even if you have to die for my promise.' So, Mr. Governor, believe me somebody will die because of this Bill. Somebody will not be here next year who could have been here, who could have lived. Who might have ever been convinced that voting for you is the right thing. And to those people who supported you some of them call themselves Harold Washington Party, them call them all types of things. They've allowed to come into existence an administration that has totally cut up our bases on these maps. That have totally destroyed

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

the basics under pending what they call the net, which no People are falling through, and I quess longer exists. because you don't see it, and you don't feel it and it doesn't come home to your district, you don't care. since you don't care, 'do the wrong thing'. Vote 'ves' cause that's where your conscience lies, if you have one. Be real. Let's start, stop talking politics. Stop saying we can't do this because the voters are going to do this. They brought you down here to have a heart, to run a government responsibly. Let's do so, and let's reject these cuts, and let's start this process over again in the hope that we'll find reality and that we'll return humanity to what we do."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver, one minute to explain your vote, Sir."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, we've heard an awful lot of talk about how sick the economy is. And I guess if you...if you look back a couple centuries they used to bleed people that were sick. And I think that perhaps some of the proposals to raise taxes would have the same effect. We'd be bleeding the economy that very much needs to recover. I'm really distressed to see that a lot of the Members of the chamber are enjoying, or appear to enjoy, the misery of the people of Illinois. But the taxes are not there to prove the Governor wrong. Our Governor was the only gubernatorial candidate when he was first If we hadn't gotten that elected to endorse a surtax. surtax, we'd be...we would have another \$700 million hole in our budget. But we do need to talk about the years of under-funding for the educational teachers, for our pension Senate Bill 95 was violated two years in a row. systems. Now we're going after 3% more. I think we need to get a

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

commitment to continue our funding of the pension systems."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren, one minute to explain your vote, Sir."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I read in the Chicago papers in December, as Speaker, President Rock, Leader Philip and Leader Daniels met, that there was general agreement that . we had a problem. I can tell you that I could come up with a better solution to the problem than the one before us today, but it wouldn't get sixty votes. Indeed, I all 117 of my colleagues could come up with a better solution than the one we have before us today, but those 117 other solutions couldn't get 60 votes either. This is the one that will get 60 votes, and for that reason, I'm going to go along and solve what all of the leaders have agreed is a problem the state faces. But having said that, many of you know that I'm a lame duck. Let me say as one who is going to be leaving in a few months, we cannot continue to balance the budget of the State of Illinois on the backs of future taxpayers by robbing the pension..."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are, Martinez 'no'. Have all voted? I'm sorry, the Clerk has taken the record. On this Motion, there are 63 'ayes' and 54 'nos'. And the House does concur in the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 424 and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental #4 Senate Senate Bill 250, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 250. This...this Bill now deletes everything after the enacting clause, everything that was in the

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

original Bill, I should say, and provides that the filing fee requirement to the Clerk of the Circuit Court in Chicago and in Cook County for actions instituted under the Municipal Code by private parties seeking an order to compel an owner to repair an unsafe or dangerous building, that that filing fee be waived. That's all this Bill does, so that if you have in Chicago a building that has many building code violations and is dangerous, there's an opportunity to file an action to compel the enforcement of an action to require rehabilitation, repair, or demolition of that building. And this says, when you do that as a private party, you don't have to pay a filing fee in order to keep a building safe from children who might be playing within it. That's all it does. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, in a previous life fhiz Bill said that the number of Associate Judges in Cook County would remain the same, even though the population of that county had declined...On your word, Sir, is that language totally removed from this Bill?"

Preston: "It is. It is out of this Bill. Still a good concept, but out of this Bill."

Black: "Well, we can certainly debate the merits of that Bill, but it no longer is a part of Senate Bill 250?"

Preston: "It is not."

Black: "Is the only thing in this Bill amending what you have just said, amending the Municipal Code on building demolition?

Preston: "It is."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt?' Mr. Wennlund, did you want to speak on this? Mr. Wennlund.

Wennlund: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Wennlund: "Representative Preston, will you explain, for the House is a little noisy at this point, exactly what it is that this Bill is designed to accomplish?"

Preston: "Yes, Representative. If there is a building in Chicago that is in such disrepair with so many Building Code violations that it presents a danger to the community either as...a place where children might go and play and be injured or it's just extremely dangerous, current law provides that a private individual may a file lawsuit to compel the city to begin a process of enforcement of Building Code violations against this property. That's current law. This Bill says, if you as a private citizen indeed file that lawsuit, you don't have to pay a filing fee - a court filing fee. That's waived. That's all the Bill does."

Wennlund: "Thank you, very much. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This starts a bad precedent in Illinois. What we're doing is we're opening pandora's box to say that any person in a community who wants to file suit against a city doesn't have to pay a filing fee, which you and I and the General Assembly just increased, horrendously, to prevent frivolous filings. But it allows any individual to sue cities who lives in a community to enforce an ordinance regarding unsafe buildings. That starts a bad precedent in Illinois and starts a bad precedent for all cities in Illinois, not just the City of Chicago, because you know what's going to happen next.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

This Spring we're going to see all kinds of Bills coming down the pike waiving filing fees for anyone who wants to sue a city or a village with regard to forcing them to enforce an ordinance or a provision of an ordinance. And that when you get back home, your cities and villages are going to say, 'What are you guys doing? We're going to have to defend these filing fees, and on top of that we're going to have to raise your taxes because we're going to have to pay the legal cost of defending all of these litigants, defending all of these cases that are filed. You're going to cause a tax increase.' I urge you to take a real careful look at this Bill because its starts a bad precedent. This Bill should not become law."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I have almost no voice here, but I'll try to say Representative Wennlund is right. Only he really didn't go far enough in his comments. I remember when first passed the aggravated battery statute, we had a limited number of categories that were covered to make that aggervated battery. And what we've done for the last ten or fifteen years is to progressively add to that statute so that it's just become unworkable. That's exactly what will happen in this case. Anything that is sociably desirable, and it certainly is, we'll waive the filing fee. We'll waive filing fees when there's a violation by a landlord of a tenant's rights; we'll waive filing fees in a grievous cases of wilful and wanton liability; we'll waive fees in any number of areas to the place where there will be an open door to the court house to some people, and a...expensive court door to the court house in others, and the ultimate effect of this will be to make a dual justice, to cost revenue, and to make a system that

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

ultimately won't work well for anybody. Ι Representative Preston is right. This is something that not the waiver of the fee but the action itself that ought be pursued and the issue ought to be addressed. this really is a bad, bad precedent for our civil justice and if we do it here there's no limit to how often we're going to do it and what effect it's going to have not only on municipalities but in our whole civil justice system. Every circuit clerk in the State of Illinois is going to see this and over the course of the next six months, they're going to see a system dismantled and made inconsistent that now works very, very well. Right you can file without a filing fee if you're indigent. You file a form called 'in forma pauperis' or whatever Latin is...alleging that you don't have the money to file, and in that case, the filing fee is waived where they that right, now, in the law. But if you do this, you're opening a pandora's box that won't be closed very easily."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I think the previous two speakers misunderstand this quite straight-forward simple Bill. This has nothing to do with aggravated penalties; it has nothing to do with indigent plaintiffs; it has nothing to do with suits against the All this Bill says is, that property owners within 1200 feet of a property which is in deteriorated shape, who currently have the opportunity to go to court to seek demolition of that building, will not have to pay the 175 or the \$250 filing fee when they do so. That's the only issue that's before this Body. A homeowner who's sitting kitty-cornered from a property that is going to wrnckand ruin, ought to be able to take the owner of that property

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

to court, which he or she may do under present Illinois law, but should not be held up for 250 bucks for the pleasure of doing so. We're not looking at the 'down the road of fantastic schemes,' that the former speaker suggests. If you care about homeowners having the opportunity to protect their kids from a building that's falling apart just down the street, and on those childrens' heads, you ought to be voting to support this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPIke: "Yes."

Ryder: "Thank you very much. I'm wondering, Representative Preston, if the City of Chicago has taken a position on the Bill?"

Preston: "I am informed that they have no position on the Bill.

That's what I'm told."

Ryder: "I'm wondering if the Illinois Municipal League..."

Preston: "Oh, I'm sorry I am now told that the City of Chicago is for this Bill."

Ryder: "I see. And I'm wondering if the Illinois Municipal is taken a position?"

Preston: "Who cares."

Ryder: "Somehow, that's an expected response, Representative, thank you very much. The rest of downstate may care."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill?' Mr. Preston, to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't burden this Body
with closing but there were some misconceptions that I
think should be pointed out. This Bill applies solely to

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

the City of Chicago not to downstate. That's why I can't why the Northwest Municipal League would be terribly concerned at Chicago and Chicago alone, number Number two, this does not permit lawsuits against the City of Chicago with a fee waiver. This is a lawsuit against the owner of property that is in such a condition that it may imperil the life and limb of people who live near that property. And, in such a case, this simply says that a private citizen may file a suit against the owner of that property to compel the owner of that property to bring his or her property into compliance with the building Codes of the City of Chicago. That's all this Bill does, and the purpose of it is to protect the life and limb of individuals. primarily children, primarily who may seek to live in abandoned buildings that are in a very dangerous condition. That's all the does. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 250?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. On this Motion there are 68 'ayes' and 37 'nos'. The House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 250, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 923, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I move the House 'do adopt' the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 923. The Bill has several provisions. I hope you will bear with me as I try to explain them. One provision is identical to that which we just passed in

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Senate Bill 250. I won't describe again for you what that provision does. Secondly, there is a proposal that came to this chamber as Senate Bill 946. It defines when asbestos abatement shall happen in the state. It passed the Senate, overwhelmingly, but did not get out of House Committee. There's also a technical change requested by the City of Chicago with respect to tax sales and I'd be happy to answer your questions if you have any. It's fairly complex. And finally, there's a provision that would bring the State of Illinois into compliance with Federal Clean Air Act requirements with respect to chlorofluorocarbons."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill and I would like all of you to remember that we visited this last spring and with the help of the late Representative. Richard Mautino and others we defeated this measure. me call your attention to page 53. If you pass this, you're saying the General Assembly hereby and declares it to be public policy of this state to discourage the unnecessary use of CFC's...compounds to encourage producers of CFC's and compounds to replace them with alternative substances; and to promote the use of equipment to recover and re-cycle existing chlorofluorocarbons. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill goes on to say, by July 1, 1992, which has already passed, the board shall adopt regulations that require businesses that service, or dispose of motor vehicle air conditioning systems, including, but not limited to...and to use refrigeration recovery equipment. Nothing has changed since we defeated this Bill last spring. The Federal EPA regulations and the Montreal protocol will kick in whether we like it or not.

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

But the fact remains that if you speed up the process, if you turn the regulators and the inspectors of Illinois lose on this issue, what you are going to do is to drive corner, garage mechanic, who changes the air conditioning refrigerant in your car. You're drive out of business the mechanic who comes to your house to fix the air conditioning system in your house. Now let us not be hypocritical. If you're going to vote for this take the air conditioning system out of your car; take air conditioning system out of your house. There is no substitute on the market, as we speak, for refrigerant 22. is what drives the air conditioning system in your house. To the best of my knowledge, there is currently no replacement on the market though they think it is but a short time away, for R12, the refrigerant system that air conditioning system in your car. Furthermore, the recovery system, which costs upwards of \$5000 per unit. yet available so that a service man can haul this to the roof of a house, or a roof of commercial establishment that has a roof-top air conditioning system. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, you can vote on this, and you can say it's a strong environmental Bill; or you can, once, for once, as we did last spring, utilize a little common sense. You all use air conditioning in your car and your home. This is going to double, if not triple, the price of system. The federal regulations will hold. The Montreal protocol will hold. I see know reason to adopt in the state and turn the pollution control board this loose to drive more and more of the neighborhood mom and pop type businesses out of existence. Don't fool yourselves. There is no commercially acceptable substitute on the market right now for these refrigerant products. I

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Just to correct the Gentleman. First, July 1st 1992, hasn't yet happened. Secondly, I think he misunderstands the point of the Bill. This is not a massive activity from the environmental community. In fact. it certainly acceptable to the organized business groups in the State of Illinois. We worked with the Illinois Retail Merchants, with the Illinois Manufacturers' Association on the provisions of this Bill. They do not stand, in any way, shape, or form, in opposition. The real point is that the Federal Clean Air Act is coming to the State of Illinois, and if we want our small businesses to have exemptions and waivers because a product is available to them, or because they face particular economic hardship, the only way we will provide that relief is through passage of these provisions in Senate Bill you're concerned about your small business guys. don't think for a minute you're protecting them by opposing this measure. If that were true, I think organized business in the state would oppose this measure, There are substantial misunderstandings about There were in June, and I'm sorry to say that provisions. the intervening months have not helped educate us all as much as they might have. The proper vote from a business perspective as well as an environmental perspective, on this measure is a 'yes'. Remember, there are other important elements in this Bill, as well, and I certainly hope that you will join me in supporting this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Corrected Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

923?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Klemm to explain his vote. Mr. Klemm."

- Klemm: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention that although the Speaker of the Bill has indicated that industry supports the Bill, there is really no substitute for the R12. My company does manufacture refrigeration and we can not get a substitute gas and can not find the equipment that will take R22. So, really, despite of what you're talking about, it's not available and you're asking these manufacturers to do something that's not there and I think that's a mistake and I think you should vote 'no' and carefully look at the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The
 Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 38
 'ayes' and 69 'nos', and the House does not adopt a Second
 Corrected Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 923
 and this Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional
 Majority is hereby declared lost. Supplemental Calendar
 #5, Senate Joint Resolution 121. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SJR 121 really amends SJR 96 that we passed in response to the problems with the Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. SJR 96 created an advisory panel to the Department of Revenue to restructure the pharmaceutical assistance program. Under this proposal the report was to be submitted to the General Assembly in February, but due to the budget problems we've been to meet, so SJR 121 simply amends the reporting date to April 7. I move adoption of the Resolution."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 121 be adopted?' By use of the Attendance Roll Call the Resolution is adopted. Representative Giglio in the

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Chair."

Giglio: "Supplemental Calendar #6, on Concurrence appears House
Bill 185. Representative Daniels."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Daniels: to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 185. This is a general obligation bond act requires 71 votes, to pass and does set forth the increase in the states 'G.O.' bond authorization by \$431,650,000 which then gives us an opportunity to return \$13 million to the state's General Revenue Fund, in accordance with the budget plan through Emergency Budget Act of 1992 that you just passed. clarifies that expenditures for lease purchase agreements be made from contractual service line items requested by Comptroller, Netsch. and removes the provisions that limits the amount of 'G. O.' bonds the state may sell at any one bond sale. I would ask for favorable passage of the same."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison; Representative McPike."

McPike: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the..."

Speaker Giglio: "Give the Gentleman some attention.".

McPike: "I'd like to explain to the Democrats what is in this Bill because I explained it incorrectly in the Caucus. Mr. Dunn and others had asked questions. In the meeting in the Governor's Office this morning and in the first draft of the Bill that we saw, the Governor asked for \$400 million for refinancing or refunding bonds, and he asked for 600 million in new bond authorization for capital projects. At that time we asked the Bureau of the Budget for detailed information, and we did not have that when we went to Caucus. After we sat with the Bureau of the Budget, it became apparent that they did not need 400 million in new

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

bond authorization, because they already have 150 of unauthorized of unobligated but authorized bond obligations available at this time, so the \$400 million was changed to 350 million. This is for refinancing. So the total amount that they will have available for refinancing million. That is 350 million in this Bill and 150 million of unobligated authorization that is still on the books. That's 500 million, and they anticipate approximately 450 of the 500 million will be used for refinancing in order to save \$13 million. The 600 million that was asked for for projects, was little in error. After going through their list it appears that they do not need 600 million they need 81,650,000. So, the bureau was only off by 519 million. So, with that understanding, and I apologize for the misinformation, but with that understanding as to what is in the Bill, I support it."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "I'd ask your favorable support."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House accept Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 185?' This concurrence. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This Bill requires 71 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question, there are 98 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 185. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. The previous Bill having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the Body, with use of the Attendance Roll Call, to suspend the rule where a committee can meet...can not meet while the House is in Session and the posting notice so that the Rules Committee can meet immediately at the well to...move on the consideration of the gubernatorial compliance on the Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 922. I've discussed this with Representative Churchill and we are all in agreement on it."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 Is there any discussion? There being none, the Attendance
 Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. The Rules
 Committee will meet immediately right in front of the well.

 We have two more Bills. We have two more Bills to do
 before we leave. Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 120. Resolved by the Senate of the 87th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, The House of Representatives concurring, herein: that when the Senate adjourns on Tuesday, January 21st, 1992, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 31st, 1992, 12:00 o'clock and noon; when the Representatives adjourns on Tuesday, January 21st, 1992, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 29th, 1992, 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 5th, 1992. 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Thursday , February 13th, 1992, 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 19th, 1992, 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 26th, 1992, at 12:00 noon and when it adjourns on that date it stands adiourned until Wednesday, March 4th, 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Friday, March 6th, 1992, at 12:00 noon; and adjourns on that date it stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 11th, 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Friday, March 13th, 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when adjourns on that date, it stant adjourned until Wednesday, March 18th, 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands until Friday, March 20th, 1992, at 12:00 noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 25th, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Friday, March 27th 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that date. stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 31st, 1992, at 12:00 o'clock noon."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Report on Committee on Rules. Representative Matijevich, Chairman, from Committee on Rules has reports on January 15th. 1992. The Senate Rules met pursuant to Rule 46.1; made the following report of House Bill Amendatory Veto by the Governor. Senate Bill compliance and on March 21, 1992, the Committee on met pursuant to Rule 46.1 makes the following report of the Bills Amendatory Veto by the Governor compliance with Rule 46.1(b) Senate Bill 922."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Supplemental Calendar."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #7 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Supplemental #7. House Calendar Supplemental #7, appears Senate Bill 922. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I would . move that the House do accept the Governor's recommendations for change on Senate Bill 922. The Governor made two changes. First, he added a reverter clause in a section dealing with the conveyance of property to the Village of Mokena. And secondly, he removed language relating to some provisions on fire protection districts. We're all in agreement, Mr. Speaker this should be accepted, so I would move so for the acceptance."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, do you rise in support of this?"

Black: "I just have one question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Black: "Representative, is the are the fire district trustee association are they did they sign on to this?"

Steczo: "I'm not sure if they signed on or not, Representative
Black, but the House Sponsor whose language it was had no
problem with the Governor removing it, so I'll just leave
it at that."

Black: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 922?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The clerk will take the record. On this Motion there, 96 'ayes' and no 'nays', and this Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

change. Senate Bill 922, having received a Constitution Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Deering on a Motion. Representative...Representative Deering moves to bypass the Committee on Assignment for immediate and waive the appropriate rule so that House Resolution 1397 can be heard immediately. Is there any opposition to the Gentleman's Motion? It's an Agreed Resolution. Mr. Black it's an Agreed Resolution."

Black: "What is it? What are we agreeing to?"

Speaker McPike: "It's an Agreed Resolution that we would like to get on."

Black: "Well, I don't...nobody over here seems to know who agreed to it."

Speaker McPike: "Who agrees to Agreed Resolutions on your side of the aisle?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, it is. We know that there is someone over there that does it."

Black: "Well, it has been Representative Olson, but I don't see
Representative Olson."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, Mr. Deering, who just agreed to it."

Black: "It was Ewing."

Speaker McPike: "There he is, he's right there. He's right in the center aisle. Well, did you agree that Mr. Deering's, resolution was an Agreed Resolution? Yes. Alright, is there any opposition to the Gentleman's Motion for immediate consideration of an Agreed Resolution? There being none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, the Gentleman's Motion carries. Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1397, Deering, et al; House Resolution 1468, Preston; 1469, Woolard; 1470, Black; 1471, Hasara. Oh, that's it."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I move the adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1466, Balanoff."

Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2742, offered by Representative Weaver, a Bill for An Act to amend the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2743, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for An Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2744, offered by Representative Doederlein, a Bill for An Act to amend the Firearm Owners Identification Card Act. First Reading the Bill. House Bill 2745, offered byMcCracken, a Bill for An Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2746, offered by McCracken, a Bill for An Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2747, offered by McCracken, a Bill for An Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2748, offered by Representataive Davis and Woolard, a Bill for An Act to amend the Lottery Law. First Reading of the House Bill 2749, offered by Representative Woolard, a Bill for An Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2750, offered by Representative Noland, a Bill for An Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "This is a final Bill for this evening Session.

House Bill 969, Representative Wolf."

107 Legislative Day

January 21, 1992

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 969. Amendment #1 becomes the Bill and includes a...an agreement between the City of Chicago the Chicago Police, and the Chicago It provides for an annuitant benefit Fire. increase from 475 to 650 and for benefit...from...increase from 400 to 500. I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 (sic- and #2) to House Bill 969."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Parke. The Gentleman agrees. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 (sicand #2) to House Bill 969?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 114 'ayes' and no 'nays'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 (sicand #2) to House Bill 969. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand adjourned until March 31st. March 31st, the schedule has been changed. March 31st, the House will be in Perfunctory Session at various times in February and March. We will be back in Session 12:00 noon, March 31st. The Gentleman moves we stand adjourned until then. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/29 09:02:04

JANUARY 21, 1992

HB-0185	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	56
HB-0185	MOTION	PAGE	9
HB-0969	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
HB-0969	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62
HB-0969	MOTION	PAGE	9
HB-0969	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	14
HB-2738	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2739	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2740	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
H8-2741	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-2742	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2743	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2744	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2745	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2746	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2747	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2748	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
H8-2749	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
HB-2750	FIRST READING	PAGE	62
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	12
SB-0133	MOTION	PAGE	10
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	45
SB-0424	THIRD READING	PAGE	1
SB-0424	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	8
SB-0424	CONFERENCE	PAGE	14
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	6
SB-0922		PAGE	60
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	51
SB-0923		PAGE	10
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	5
SB-1470		PAGE	5
	ADOPTED	PAGE	12
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	11
SJR-0120		PAGE	59
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0121		PAGE	55
SJR-0121	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	55

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REPRESENTATIVE RICE	PAGE	ì
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	4
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	4
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	8
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	8
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	9
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	13
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	14
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	56
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	57
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	59
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	61
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	62
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	63