54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The House will come to order, and Members will be in their seats. We are joined this morning by Chaplain James A. Lewis of the Church of the Holy Spirit of Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Lewis is the guest of Representative Mike Curran. If we have guests in the balcony, they may wish to rise for the invocation. Pastor Lewis."

Pastor Lewis: "Eternal God, our Father, Father of the Universe, Father of this nation, this state, and this Assembly. Eternal God, we call upon Your Holy and Righteous Name this morning, especially for this legislative Assembly, that You might pour out Your oil of grace upon the heads of the men and women who are gathered here to represent the people of this great State of Illinois, and, oh, God, we pray, dear that You might give us more wisdom, knowledge and understanding that we might better not only to serve Thee, Lord, but to serve our fellow man as well. Oh, God, we pray, dear God, that You would make the rough places smooth and the crooked places straight, that men and women may be able to sit down and to reason together, to come together, to reach an understanding, and, oh, Holy Master, inasmuch that we are just weak creatures of a multi-nature down here, oh, God, we pray, Master, that You would fill this Assembly and that you might do that which You choose to do that we might be governed by Thy Holy Spirit, that You might direct our paths, be a light to a lamp...pathway and a lamp unto our feet. Oh, Lord, we pray that You would bless and encourage, give us more wisdom, knowledge and understanding that we might better be able to serve Thee. All these blessings, dear God, we ask in Your Name and for Your sake. Amen."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hartke will lead us in the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Pledge of Allegiance."

- Hartke 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 Satterthwaite: "Roll Call for Attendance. Are there excused absences? Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker. On this side of the aisle,

 Representative Monroe Flinn and...Ann Stepan are excused."

 Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Barnes and Representative Manny Hoffman...Representative Barnes and Manny Hoffman are...excused today."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, you have those names. Representative Black."
- Black: "Madam Speaker. Would the record reflect as well as the board...Representative Tenhouse, whose wife has been ill, is on his way and should be here shortly, and we'd like him on the record when he does arrive."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "If he comes up to the well, we'll excuse him now and if he comes later today, have him report to the Clerk."

Black: "Thank you. Okay."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "A hundred and thirteen people being present, a quorum is present. Members should be aware that Supplemental Cadendar #1 is on your desk, and that these are Senate Bills that are in need of House Sponsors. If Members will review that list of Senate Bills on Supplemental #1 and come to the Clerk's well to pick up any of the Senate Bills that do not yet have Sponsors in the House. The Clerk is adding Representative Tenhouse to the Attendance Roll Call for this morning. If Members will

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

come to order, we will start on the Special Order of Government Regulations, Second Reading. The Members have Bills on that Order and should be prepared their Bills: Representatives Lang, Currie and Doederlein. Representative Lang on House Bill 40 on Second Reading. Do you wish to have the Bill read a second Out of the record. Representative Currie, is the Lady in the chamber? She is not. Representative Doederlein. Out of the record. Government Regulations, Third Reading. On this Special Order the Sponsors are Anthony Young, Lang and Tenhouse. Representative Young on House Bill 8. the record. Representative Lang on House Bill Representative Lang, out of the record. Representative Tenhouse on House Bill 2489. Out of the record. Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With Memorial Day right around the corner, I have a Memorial Day speech that the...American Legion has provided so I'd like to pass it out if you're interested in getting it. When I come around, just raise your hand, and I'll be happy to give you a Memorial Day Speech."

Speaker Giglio: "The House will come to order. the Supplemental Calendar, Labor, Third Reading, appears House 589, Representative Curran. Representative Curran in the chamber? Out of the record. Alright, you want to come back? Representative Mautino. Is Representative Mautino in the chamber? 824. Out of the record. Human Services, Third Reading. Andrew McGann, Granberg, Currie. Andrew McGann, 1195. Out of the record. Representative Granberg. Representative Currie. So much for Human Services. Representative Matijevich, Constitutional Officers, Bill 967. Out of the record. Agriculture and Environment.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

The Chair would like to remind the Members of the Body and those that are listening, this is the last week for House Bills to be called. Friday is the deadline. As we are going down the Order today we may not go down the Order any more. The Chair would recommend that those people that have Bills on the Order that we are calling should be prepared to call their Bills. Representative Shirley Jones, 132...on what? What Order? Representative Jones, when we get to that Order, we'd be happy to call the Bill. Representative Barbara Currie on 2510. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2510, a Bill for an Act to create the Hospital Indigent Care Assurance Program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill will be used in...response to the question whether we can capture additional federal funds through assessments or other kinds of programs in...among provider groups that were...have not already dealt with through things like things like House Bill 1000. So, we're not in final form with the Bill, but we are working with the Department of Public Aid and various provider groups, and I'd appreciate your support for helping us move the Bill to the Senate so those discussions can continue.

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Lady's Motion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Ropp: "I didn't really hear exactly what you were saying, but does this generate or cause additional dollars to go into this program?"

Currie: "That would be the hope. As I say, we're working on

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

language with provider groups and with the department, and if we can come to a conclusion about how we can capture more federal funds, we think it would be a good idea to do so."

Ropp: "Okay. So, it's...it's...it's an attempt to generate additional federal dollars, not..."

Currie: "Yes."

Ropp: "Alright. Might these be matching dollars, or not?"

Currie: "Yes."

Ropp: "Do we have those dollars now that we can use to match?"

Currie: "No...no."

Ropp: "And so we'd also be looking at ways to generate state dollars in order to get maximum support?"

Currie: "No. No, we are trying to find a way to...to use, for example, we just saw last week in House Bill 1000 a methodology whereby assessments imposed against providers actually kept them whole with respect to those dollars but also could capture additional federal funding. We are looking at that same kind of approach for other providers of services to people who might qualify for eligibility for the federal Medicaid program."

Ropp: "Is there generally half-way decent support from...from providers to move forward on this program?"

Currie: "Yes. That's why Representative Ryder and I decided that we should move the Bill."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussions? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...stand in support of this, and...thank the Sponsor on the other side of the aisle for agreeing to allow me to be Co-Sponsor so that we might continue to work on as assessment program that, should other Bills become stalled in the process, will allow us to

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

deal fairly with that assessment process and hopefully to generate some new dollars for those providers of the state who are desperately in need of such, and I...ask for your support on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie to close. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2510 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and House Bill 2510, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Agriculture and Environment. Representative Granberg. Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Kulas. Out of the Representative Kulas. Representative Morrow. Representative Morrow in the chamber? Out of the record. Consumer Protection, Third Reading. Representative McGann. Representative 1858. Farley. House Bill Out οf the record. Representative Hartke. Economic Development. Younge. Is the Lady in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Steczo, 1867. Out οf the record. Representative Morrow. Representative Giorgi. Housing. Anthony Young. The Gentleman from Cook, House Bill Out of the record. Representative Levin. Representative Anthony Young. Out of the record. Representative Levin, Out of the record. Representative Turner, 2151. Alright, let's try it again. How about Constitutional Officers, Second Reading? Representative Williams, 1592. The Gentleman in the chamber? Out of...out of the record. Agriculture Environment, Representative Richmond. and Second Reading, Agriculture and Environment, House 345. Out of the record. Representative Schakowsky, 580,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Second Reading. Out of the record. Okay. Representative the chamber? Out Granberg in οf the Satterthwaite. Out of the record. Representative Monique Davis, House Bill 2003. Out of the record. Government Operations, Second Reading. Representative Currie, Out of the record. Representative Hicks, 624. Out of the House Bill 2242, Anthony Young. Read the Bill, record. Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2242, Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 14 of the Calendar. House Bill 2242, a

 Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act.

 Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee

 Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Wennlund and Wojcik."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund on Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 2242. Representative Wennlund. Withdraw Amendment
 #1. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Wennlund and Wojcik."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund on Amendment #2.
 Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Wennlund and Wojcik."
- Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #3. Withdraw Amendment #3. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Young on 2244.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Wennlund and Black."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund on Amendment #3. House
Bill 2244. Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Hicks.

Any...were there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 60...624,

Representative Hicks. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 624, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 624 deals with wage deductions. We've been negotiating for over two years on the issue of wage deductions and House Bill...the Amendment #1 to House 624 embodies an agreement by all sides that have been negotiating it including legal aid and the unions and others that have been opposed to some of the issues that we've been discussing. Briefly what the Bill does is makes some technical corrections in the wage deduction affidavit. It...eliminates the...what's been known as the wild card exemption as it relates to wages. It...changes the employer fee for answering a wage deduction to \$12 from \$8, and it also has a protection to consumers...increases consumers' exemptions under wage deductions from 40 times

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991 the minimum wage to 45 times the minimum wage. I ask the
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Representative Black."
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

adoption of Amendment #1."

- Black: "Representative, I know last year labor had some very serious concerns with changing that wild card exemption.

 Are you telling us with this Amendment now that...that labor is alright with...with the Amendment and, therefore, the Bill?"
- Lang: "That's correct. All parties that were involved in negotiation, including labor, have signed off on the Bill."
- Black: "Alright. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang to close. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Let's continue on Government Operations, Third Reading. House Bill 472, Representative Brunsvold. 472, Third Reading. Well, we'll come back to that, Representative...Representative Black, are you ready on House Bill 677? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. We'll come back to Representative Brunsvold."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 677, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 677, I'm joined by Co-Sponsors on both sides of the aisle. What we're trying to do is to alleviate some problems in rural

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

areas on the amount of day care slots. I'm not here to tell you that this Bill is not controversial because in some parts of the state it, unfortunately, has become controversial. Let me just say that we think this Bill is very close to being worked out with the department and all...and all parties to the day care have day care concerns in the State of Illinois, but in order to keep those discussions going, I would, at this time, ask your favorable consideration of House Bill 677."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none...Representative Deuchler, the Lady from Kane."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black?"

Black: "Sure."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Deuchler: "House Bill 677, then, relates to the day care homes or group homes?"

Black: "Day care home."

Deuchler: "And how many minor children would be allowed by one day care provider?"

Black: "Well, I don't think you want to use the word, 'minor.'

You mean infant?"

Deuchler: "Infant, yes."

Black: "Current rules allow three children under two. Under
House Bill 60...677, it would allow three children under 15
months."

Deuchler: "And what are the other numbers that are changed?"

Black: "Current rules allow one toddler two to five years. House
Bill 677 would allow one toddler 15 months to two and a
half years. Current rules allow four children, five years
and over, and House Bill 677 would allow four children, two
and a half to five years."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Deuchler: "Is this the Bill that does have some provisions for preschool and after school care?"

Black: "No. That's the group day care."

Deuchler: "I know there are some concerns of parents in my district about this number of children, very young children, being watched by one provider. So, I would...I would concur in that. I...I understand your interest in continuing the negotiations, but I think there are some very deep concerns about this number of children, very young children with one day care provider."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

LeFlore: "Representative Black, what...what will this have to do with the age category of the individuals who's involved?"

Black: "It change the categories age somewhat. Representative. It...It change...it does not change the capacity. It does change the age category, and as I said earlier, I think we're very close to working out agreed language with the Department of Children and Services and also day care center operators as well as day care home operators, but we would like to keep the process going. Let me, and I'm glad you asked the question, let me assure you that this legislation sets up these categories as permissive categories. It certainly doesn't say that a provider would have to take these younger-aged children and certainly a parent would be able to say, 'No, I don't like the age category in your home, 'and...and, therefore, might remove his or her children from that operation. So it's certainly not a mandatory thing."

LeFlore: "Are you working with other agencies along with Children and Family Services on this?"

Black: "Yes, we are. Yes, we are."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

LeFlore: "What about the Department of Human Services in Chicago?

Are they involved in...in..."

Black: "I haven't heard from them. I have heard from Day Care
Action Council and the Illinois Group Day Care Home
Association, and I...I do tell you that I think we're very
close to reaching some agreed numbers and age categories."

LeFlore: "Okay. Thank you."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, what is the intent of breaking this age bracket, and is this going to create somewhat of a...a bookkeeping problem that someone is going to have to go around and verify all of the time?"

Black: "Well, I suppose you could say that, Representative. many of us have found, particularly in downstate Illinois, that the licensing and regulatory standards on day care have become so oppressive that providers simply are getting out of the business. I fail to understand anyone's argument who would argue that we want quality day care when, in fact, we are running people out of the day care and leaving children at home alone. We think, after four years of work, that these Bills are reasonable. We're willing to...to compromise. We think we're very close to getting a compromise, but the fact remains is that affordable and available day care is simply not taking place in rural downstate Illinois. We think these two Bills address that situation, and we'd certainly be willing to work with you on any concerns that you have."

Ropp: "Well, it was kind of ironic. I had a...this is a true story. I had this four-year-old who called up...who was in a day care center and was very much opposed to this Bill.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

The reason for it because he says there's just going to be too many kids in here, and I'm not going to really have time to play with all these toys because I'm going to have to share them. Now that's a major problem I'm sure that we have to deal with. I...I...I guess I'm wondering, and I...and I share your concerns about day care, but it seems to me like when we expand this number rather substantially...we're putting a...a big burden on the person who's going to take care of all these kids, and..."

Black: "Representative, if I might. If you'll look at the Bill, in 677 we are not expanding the number of children at all. Current law allows them to have eight children with one care giver. 677 allows them to care...care for eight children with one care giver. You could add some school—age children if you had an assistant."

Ropp: "Well, my analysis says we're going from eight to 12. So, according to my analysis, it's four increased."

Black: "Well, whatever."

Ropp: "Well, you're saying that it does not increase it from eight to 12?"

Black: "If you...if you want to add four children to a day care home, you must have an assistant. The...the current law says you can care for eight. My Bill says you can care for eight. If you want to add what is commonly referred to as latchkey children, up to four of those children, you must have an assistant for a day care...you know, an assistant in the home."

Ropp: "Okay."

Black: "And that is a change in existing law."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to address the Bill just for a second and

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

how it affects my area, and I think that each of us have prejudices and concerns about each and every Bill. believe positively that this is a good Bill, and I that it will address an issue which is very, very, very much vital to the area which I represent. We do not adequate day care facilities available now, and what I believe this Bill will do, it will expand the opportunity, especially in those areas where we're dealing with small children, and I think that we very definitely have to be concerned about the quality of care that we provide, but in most instances we're not talking about whether it's quality or not quality. We're talking about is it available or not available. My own grandson...my grand...or my daughter was trying to find a facility for him. In order to do so, she had to drive nine miles out of her way back and forth every day to work in order to find a facility to accommodate my 12-month-old grandson at the time. I think that this will provide opportunities, and I applaud the Sponsor of Bill for continuing to work with the Department of Children and Family Services and all other agencies to try and make this an acceptable Bill for everyone who is concerned. encourage each and everyone to support this legislation because I believe that it will meet a very dire need in the rural areas of this state."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 677, and on a point that I think brings credit to Representative Black. Quite frankly, Representative Black could have blasted this Bill out of here. There's enough merit in this legislation and enough sympathy in this Body so that he could have done this without any cooperation, without any help and without

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

working with this department at all, but Representative Black has taken it one step farther. He is cooperating with the department and trying to work out any differences of opinion that he can possibly do. I think legislation is exactly the right idea at exactly the right time because day care is very difficult to find in Illinois, and because the Department of Children and Family Services, and especially their licensing division, has given many of the day care operators in this state a tremendously difficult time. I want to also make sure that every Member here understands that Representative Black could simply have blasted this Bill out of here without cooperating with the department, but he is a responsible Legislator. He's giving them the opportunity to have negotiations with him. I think we ought to vote this Bill out of here with 115 'yes' votes and continue to work on it. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "Representative, the people that have been talking to me have expressed concerns about this Bill...are particularly concerned about the...last sentence that was added to the Bill that any adult person living in the day care home, if qualified, whatever that means, may be listed on the day care home license and be considered a full—time care giver. The concern is, somebody could just simply be living in the home, not providing any care, and that doesn't do the kids any good. Would you have any comments about what that provision's intended to mean and why we need that provision in the Bill?"

Black: "I think I...I think as I said earlier, and the people in your area may certainly have a different perspective than

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

the people in my area, if we are to address the latchkey in rural areas of the State of Illinois, this is phenomena the kind of legislation we need. Ι Αs told other...others who have expressed a concern about this, and I think it came out of committee unanimously, we will certainly be willing to work with those people to address We are just as interested in quality day their concerns. care as anyone in the State of Illinois. My concern is because of rules, regulations and bureaucracy, we have thousands of children who don't have any day care. the quality in that? I see some people who would rather they stay home alone or walk the streets. What's the quality in that issue? I'm willing to work with you if that sentence offends you, but for crying out Representative, let us try to get some day care slots, particularly in downstate areas οf Illinois. Representative Curran said, I could have blown this Bill out of here two weeks ago. We're working with every group. We're trying to reach an agreement. I assure you we will continue to do that, but I need this Bill to move if we're to keep people at the table."

Levin: "Okay. You know, I'd like you...if you could clarify what the intent of that sentence is because the way I read it, if somebody is physically living in the house and they're, I don't know 14 years of age or older, whether they are in fact providing any day care service. They could be, you know, it could be a two-story house, and they're watching television in the basement. That's not doing the children any good. That person is not providing service. That person is not around supervising the children, and that's the way that a lot of people read that sentence."

Black: "Well, if you'll let me respond to you, I will. The intent of that sentence is to have a day care giver who can

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

spell the person who is the primary giver. Under existing law, that person can't go to the grocery store, cannot take a sick child in that home to the doctor, cannot leave under any circumstances. If you have a provider or...or another person on that license who can be there when that person may have...when the primary provider may have to take a child to the doctor or may have to run a child to school or may have to go to the grocery store to meet the meal requirements, I don't think it weakens the process. It strengthens the process, and that is certainly our intent, and I will put that on the record."

Levin: "So your intent is that there should be at least one or whatever the requisite number of supervisors..."

Black: "Absolutely."

Levin: "...on duty at all times in terms of the children."

Black: "That's only...that's only common sense, is what both of these Bills are after. We certainly don't want the primary provider to leave the home and leave the children totally uncared for or unsupervised. Obviously that's not our intent, and that's why we're adding that sentence in the Bill, to make sure that someone is there."

Levin: "I would suggest, you know, if you get the Bill out of the House that you clarify that because that is not the way I would read it, and many others read that. It's read to be an open ended...as long as they're in the house even if they're not providing any services, that's what that says. So I would ask...encourage you if the Bill gets out, to clarify that issue."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones: "Representative Black, you're saying that if I have six kids in my house that I would have to get an assistant to help me with my children...that I would...for day care.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Now would that...in order for me to get an assistant, if a person is paying me \$50 to take care of a child each week, that means I'm going to have to go up on that person's...fee for the...children."

Black: "Representative, if you read the current law, you can have up to eight children without an assistant at the age limits that are currently specified in the current law. All this Bill does is to say you can still have eight children, we do alter the age categories somewhat, but if you want to add four more children, what we in my area call latchkey kids who may show up at 7:00, you watch them while mom goes to work, and then they go to school say at 9:00. So, say you're going to watch them two hours in the morning and maybe a couple hours in the afternoon, you can add up to four of those kind of children, but if you do, if you go from your eight license to 12, then you have to have an assistant to help you while those 12 kids are there."

Jones: "But in the home isn't it only eight kids can be in the home? I don't think you can go up to 12 or 18."

Black: "Under current law you can only have eight."

Jones: "Right. In a home, but in a day care center..."

Black: "In...in a day care home. We're...this does not address day care center legislation at all."

Jones: "Right. So in the home you only can have eight anyway right?"

Black: "That's right, under current law."

Jones: "Right. Okay, so, you would need assistants if you...you can't go up to 12 anyway."

Black: "Under current law, that's right. You can't go up to 12."

Jones: "Under the current...right...you can't go up to 12."

Black: "Right."

Jones: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Phelps."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the in support of this fine piece of rise I'm actually surprised that this Bill was not put on Consent Calendar even though it might have required some...some work and cooperation that Representative Black has extended way beyond the call duty, and I commend him in trying to work with all those You've just got to realize that much involved. downstate depends on commuting to find jobs. The work force even is sought in neighboring states in my area, and because of that and other factors, we have been left out in the way of trying to provide available resources in the way of day care needs. Give us a chance to try to work with this legislation to be sure that we can try to offer at least a little more improvement in that area, and, again, I want to commend Representative Black for his work on this."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "I move the... I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been moved. Representative Black to close."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think you've heard the comments. I certainly appreciate the support from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. All we're asking you to do with these two Bills is to let us try and work through a very serious problem, and that is to make day care available so mom or dad or both parents can go out and try to find a job and keep the family together. We're willing to work on the rough spots of the Bills. All we ask is a favorable vote to give us a chance to do that."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 677 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

is open. Representative Preston, one minute to explain your vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Preston: Contrary to some of the remarks that were made, this Bill did not receive unanimous support in committee. for one, voted against it for some of the reasons that Representative Levin mentioned. Also, some of the reasons that were not mentioned is that this Bill would provide as...as many as six small, very young children to be under the supervision of one adult supervisor, teacher, and in case of an emergency that one person could not possibly get six infants out of a house in case of a fire or some other dire emergency. So, while, yes, we need day care, we need quality day care, and if we're going to play legislation, we should do it in a way that works. I think Representative Black has tried. This doesn't yet do and since it's going to the Senate, maybe it'll be fixed up there."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 91 voting 'yes' and 6 voting 'no', and House Bill 677...House Bill 677, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like to remind the Members that this Bill received 91 'yes' votes, and it took us approximately 25 minutes to debate this Bill. If this continues, we won't have very many Bills be called by the time the deadline comes Friday. So, I would ask...I sure would like to remind the Members to pay attention as to what's going on. Representative Brunsvold, we're going to go back to two Bills on Second Reading before we continue the Third, and on that Order appears House Bill 595, Representative Rotello. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 595, a Bill for an Act in relationship to employer-provided health care. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted previously."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 2503, Representative Lang. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2503, a Bill for an Act concerning health care services. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang on Amendment #2."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with utilization review. It's the process by which outside parties review hospital bills and doctor bills to determine their veracity. Amendment #2 simply deletes HMOs from the Bill, and it's an agreement between the HMOs and the Hospital Association. I ask the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, the question is...All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On the Order of Government Operations, Third Reading, appears House Bill 472, Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 472, a Bill for an Act to create the Quad Cities Interstate Metropolitan Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill affects only the county of Rock Island in Illinois and Scott County in Iowa. This Bill has been in the works now for over three years. We passed, two years ago, a compact between Iowa and Illinois which was passed by both the Senate and the House in Iowa and the Senate and the House in Illinois and signed by both Governors, sent to Congress, and the compact simply set a...a outline of what we'd like to do as far as a metropolitan authority to address issues like garbage disposal, port...water port operations, mass transit, airports, bridges, parks and recreation: a cooperative effort between two counties and two different states. We're now at a point where Iowa, the Iowa House has passed this Bill, and the Iowa Senate has also passed. It's on the Governor Branstedt's desk. the procedure before we would go to the the last of people to ask them if they would like to set up this Quad City Metropolitan Authority to deal with these specific issues and these issues only. The provisions in this are with front door referendum on both cases of setting up the authority and then if there is to be a quarter cent sales tax in both counties, would also be done by front door referendum. This Bill has been worked on by all local officials, mayors, county board chairmans, a lot of the leadership people on both sides of the river and in the Auad Cities, and I would ask for your support and passage of House Bill 472."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall House Bill 472 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

are 109 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no', and House Bill 472, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black on House Bill 678. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 678, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is very similar to the Bill that we just passed. What we're doing with House Bill 678 is to increase the number of children that can be cared for in a group day care home from the current 12 people to 16. We do also specify the age breakdown for the 16 children. This Bill was passed into law in 1987, and because of regulatory problems, I think fewer group day care home bill or group day care homes have been licensed in the State of Illinois. Again. trying to do and what we're trying to work out with the providers in this Bill is a method to take care of kids in areas where we don't have the luxury of a number of day care centers. I would urge your support for this Bill and ask...and I'd be glad to answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Preston: "Representative Black, under the provisions of 678, how many children are supervised by only one supervisor at the day care facility?"

Black: "I think the current rule is one. If it goes to 16, there
 must be two."

Preston: "How many children under the age of six years of age are

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

supervised by only one supervisor at the day care
facility?"

Black: "Under six? Current law, it would be ten. House Bill 678 would be 12."

Preston: "So, as many as 12 children would be under the age of six. How about under the age of three? How many children would need only one supervisor under the age of three?"

Black: "It doesn't change from existing law."

Preston: "Alright, so this would raise it from 10 to 12 children under the age of six? Representative, haven't people contacted you about their concern about so many children under the supervision of only one adult in case of any emergency situation?"

Black: "Not...not when the ratio in a day care center is one to seven."

Preston: "Does that mean nobody has contacted you with a concern about the ratio of adult supervisors to children under the age of six?"

Black: "No, they have not."

Preston: "Okay. Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Preston: "They have contacted me regarding that concern and for that reason I'm going to be voting 'present' on this. I hope those concerns will be worked out, should it get out of here, because there is unquestionably a need for additional day care in Illinois, but again, there's a need for quality and safe day care, and in case of any emergency situation which happens in schools and in private homes, and can happen in day care homes, in case of any one of those emergency situations, one adult getting 12 young children, six years of age or under, out of a day care facility is simply a disaster. It cannot be accomplished. You can't pick up all these kids up in your arms and move

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

them with any dispatch out of an emergency such as a fire, and we'll be real concerned about it unfortunately should one of those tragedies happen and we don't respond well in advance. We only respond with news releases and news conferences after a tragedy, but this is a time when good legislation should be looked at, and...this is an attempt but not yet there."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Lake,
Representative Frederick."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Frederick: "Could you tell me, Representative Black, how many toddlers under the age of two will be allowed in the present allocation?"

Black: "It breaks it down under 15 months. The existing law says you can have four. House Bill 678 says you can have four."

Frederick: "Okay, and then you have in addition to that 12 other children. Is that correct?"

Black: "The only way one care giver could take care of 12 children if they were all school age. That's embodied in the Bill."

Frederick: "Otherwise there would be two..."

Black: "Yes."

Frederick: "...care givers?"

Black: "Yes."

Frederick: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Frederick: "I regretfully rise to oppose this Bill. It seems to me that safety of the children is not the overriding interest in this legislation, and I really think, in my part of the state where we've had some accidents occur, that one care giver could not get four toddlers out of a

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

home if there were a fire, and for this reason I oppose House Bill 678."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke.

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I...I've been listening to the debate on this issue, and the argument of 4, 6, 8, 12, 14 young children in a home for a catastrophe, God willing no one ever has that, but I must respectfully point out, let's use some common sense on this. What difference does it make if there's 8 children in a home or 12 children in the home? You're still going to have the same problem. One must understand, and in downstate rural Illinois, there tremendous need for day care, and I think this Bill solves that problem, provides for those people that have needs, and if you just want to cloud the water because there's 8 kids in a house or 12 kids in a house, you're fooling yourself because if there's a catastrophe, there's a catastrophe. It doesn't make any difference what the You're not going to be able to get 'em out number is. anyway. I think this Bill takes care of a need that rural Illinois has. You can't continue to stick your head in the I will support this Bill, and I ask this Body to support it, also."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have been out of the chamber in a meeting, and I...this may have been covered more elaborately than it needs to be. This is a very unfortunate and apprehensive—making Bill. The difference between 8 children and 12, Representative, is unbelievable. It is perfectly clear that you have never had to look after either 8 or 12 for a day or you would recognize that it makes an enormous difference. We're talking about little children, children who can get into

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

all kinds of mischief, children who can run in the street, children who can put their fingers into electric sockets. This is an outrageously dangerous piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black to close."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'm glad joined by Sponsors on both sides of the aisle. pleased that the Chicago Sun Times endorsed this Bill, and I'm amazed that someone said, 'This is an outrageously dangerous Bill.' Let me tell you what's outrageously It's outrageously dangerous to hide behind the umbrella of quality day care when it isn't available. outrageously dangerous when you leave those kids home alone with nobody to care for them. It's outrageously dangerous when you let them walk the streets. Now don't hide behind some kind of a false assumption. Help us get day care. you're interested in kids, then work with us. For crying out loud let us have day care, affordable and available day care downstate. I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 678 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Hultgren, one minute to explain your vote."

Hultgren: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the provisions of this Bill correctly, the situation under which one care giver might have 12 children in their care would only be in those instances where the children were of school age, and if you think about it, how many first grade teachers have 12 children or indeed 15 or 18 or 20 children under their care all day long? So, indeed, if we limit it to 12, the class size, if you will, is much smaller than the class size in the typical kindergarten or first grade room in the State of Illinois. If what...if...if the first

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

grade teacher can take care of 20, it seems to me that the day care operator can take care of 12."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Department of Children and Family Services worked hard to try to find compromise ground with the advocates of Bill, compromise ground that would not put at risk small children in facilities that do not have adequate adult supervision. The national organizations that set standards for the numbers of children that safely can be kept in homes, group homes and family homes would reject out of hand the proposal that is before you. If you care about the safety of our youngsters, and if the advocates of this Bill cared about the safety of our youngsters, we could have forged a compromise that would have made it possible for group home providers and day care home providers to add school age children, after school children, latchkey kids to their programs without excessive risk to infants and toddlers. Some of you people in the House are new parents, parents of new babies. I don't know how you'd feel at the prospect of the numbers of infants that could be cared for by a handful of adults as is proposed in House Bill 678. I think this would be a bad Bill for the people who live in the City of Chicago. I know that people in DuPage and Lake County have expressed severe reservations about it. advocates had a chance to work on compromises that would help us solve the problem of latchkey children. rejected that offer. This legislation is bad legislation, and I think those of you who are voting 'yes' should reconsider your support."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, I wasn't going to rise until the last speaker got up.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

There's a little infor...misinformation going around here. First of all, we do care about our children. We care about our children enough to get them off the streets and into a day care home where they ought to be well-served, and the previous speaker also indicated that perhaps DCFS was opposed to it. Representative Black and I and others have been in meetings with DCFS all along. very close to...to an agreement. Everything is being worked out, but we can't work it out unless we move this Bill along. I think it's a poor assumption saying that we don't care about children if ... if we don't have a certain number in the house or...or don't have the availability to get them out in case of emergency. No one's come to us yet with any kind of an indication or methodology as to how many kids you'd need to get out in an emergency. We're working with DCFS on that to establish procedures and...and think we need to get this Bill out to...to keep the process moving. A green vote is the only vote for the kids of Illinois."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', and House Bill 678, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill...House Bill 841, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 882, Representative Wyvetter Younge. 882. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 882, a Bill for an Act in relationship to East St. Louis. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 882 establishes an enterprise zone corporation in the East St. Louis area that would be a demonstration of how to economically revitalize the tax base of a very, very severely financially depressed

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

city. This bill would permit the East St. Louis government to establish a not-for-profit corporation that would have the responsibility for coming up with a development plan, a plan as to how to attract business and how to provide...help the municipality in reference to its municipal services. The way the Bill is written at this time...the key point now would be to step in and correct one of the basic municipal services which is...present and that is trash collection. This enterprise zone corporation would be the instrument through which the people of East St. Louis would clean up the...trash that has greatly destroyed the appearance and image of the city. This would be paid for through a .40% property tax which would be a front door referendum that would be passed as a result of a city ordinance asking the people to put this on the ballot. also would take advantage of the fact that in Build Illinois \$100,000 worth of funds for there is planning solid waste disposal. I believe that this Bill houses the frame of reference that I have been working with DCCA in reference to an economic recovery demonstration that was promised by the last administration. Mr. Grayson has been permitting his staff to work with us on a basis to define that demonstration. DCCA is opposed to this Bill because it believes that its administrative cost in reference to it would be \$150,000. I...I don't believe that it would have that administrative cost, and I believe that I have crafted a Bill in such a way to handle the of ...of setting αp this enterprise believe that East St. Louis is the site, corporation. I the one site in this state, that there can be phenomenal growth and development, and I believe that this Bill will form the frame of reference for an economic recovery demonstration which will help to make sound a economy that

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

has been shattered by its tax base going from \$178 million to \$38 million. It's an economy that has been shattered by half the people moving away from the city, and for those reasons I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I...I must rise in reluctant opposition to the Sponsor's Bill. What...what attempting to do, while laudable, opens up a she's veritable Pandora's Box that all of you will face if this Bill should become law. First of all, they are already in an enterprise zone, and if you then create an enterprise zone assistance fund to more specifically aid that enterprise zone, what you're going to have then immediate opposition from the other 82 enterprise zones throughout the state or, what I think all of vou need attention to. you will cause all the other 82 enterprise zones to petition the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for additional financial assistance. Even though the Lady has tried very creatively to add funding from a TIF district, you are still getting into legislation that is not available to other enterprise zones throughout the state. Should this become law, then every enterprise zone in the State of Illinois will want treatment, and I submit to you that that would seem fair but certainly not affordable, and it is for that reason that I rise in reluctant opposition to the Lady's Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Younge to close."

Younge: "Thank you. The special fund set up in the Treasury would only house money that came from this enterprise zone, and therefore, it will not in any way affect any enterprise zone outside of East St. Louis. If other municipalities that have enterprise zones wanted a specific or a...a

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

similar demonstration in their cities. then it would be possible for any Legislator to do so through legislation, therefore, the objection so, that...Mr...and Representative Black has come up with, it has no bearing on other enterprise zones. The funds from the special tax and funds from the TIF district would be put into the special fund, and that would be the only basis that there would be funding for this corporation. Our situation is that there has not been administration of the enterprise zone. Our situation is that our new mayor and our new municipality wishes to develop our enterprise zone through this local corporation, and so we're asking you to assist us in a way that will not affect any other enterprise zone, and for those reasons I ask for your support of matter."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 882 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I support the Lady's Bill, and I can't understand why anyone would be voting 'no'. Everyone realizes that the City of East St. Louis has had than its share of economic problems. She's brought forth a Bill that would allow them to tax themselves in order to improve their economic conditions. She's not asking the state for one dime in this Bill. simply a...demonstration program in the enterprise zone in East St. Louis that would allow them to self impose, at their option, an income tax and to use other moneys generated locally to help support this plan. I think it's a good She ought to be commended for...for bringing it program. before us. They want to pull themselves up by the boot straps, and why anyone would want to tell them, 'No, you

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991 can't do that,' is beyond me. There should be a lot of green votes."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 64 voting 'yes', and 48 voting 'no', and House Bill 882, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Steczo, 885. Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Representative John 938. John Dunn, Dunn. Out of the record. Representative Wyvetter Younge on 1038. Out of the record. Representative Granberg on 1198. Representative Granberg on 1198. Do you wish to call this Bill? Out of the record. Representative Hicks, 1297. Third Reading. the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1297, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1297 is a Bill that would take all of the special funds involved around with different agencies, take all those special funds, put them in the GRF. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, have you looked at the Fiscal Notes filed to this Bill?"
- Hicks: "Absolutely, Mr. Black, I have."
- Black: "Do you...do you care to enlighten us on...on the Fiscal

 Notes or...obviously you don't agree with them, I assume."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hicks: "Well, Mr. Black, some of the Fiscal Notes I... I do agree with, some of them I do not. I'll give you an example. In the committee itself when we passed this Bill out, I made very special reference to the 144 special funds that I and my intent of my legislation were to affect one of those funds I made very specific reference to, for example, the Road Fund, some \$750 million dollars of which I specifically said during the debate...the...the discussion in the committee that was...that were not affected by this, and yet we have a...a Fiscal Note dealing with the Road Fund, some \$750 million dollars. That's not in my...my The intent of the legislation is not to be legislation. that. Also the intent of the legislation is not to simply take dollars away from funds that they need for the running of those funds. The intent of the legislation is to take dollars currently not being used and that we anticipate to use, put those dollars in to be able to fund education for our kids, to be able to take care of part of the \$1.5 billion dollars we're in the hole. I think that's sensible legislation. I think it's sensible to take money that is not being used and be able to put it to good use in the State of Illinois."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. appreciate your comments. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Ι must rise, and certainly...I'm certainly not going to berate the Sponsor hope everybody looks at this very of this Bill, but I carefully, because I'll tell you something. This is an attempt to solve the very complex problems of our crisis with what may be, perhaps being charitable, an overly simplistic solution. What this Bill would do is to take all special state funds not used at the end of the lapse period of each fiscal year and put it in the GRF.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Now on...on its face that doesn't...that doesn't sound too bad, but do you know what all special funds include? it up in the State Finance Act, Chapter 127, Paragraphs 14101 through 141285. There are dozens of them, including the Capital Development Bond Fund, Ag Premium Fund, Motor Fuel Tax Fund, Child Care Expansion Funds, AFDC Energy Assistance Fund, Veterans Home Funds...on and on and on. The Gentleman's Bill would take every penny of these funds not spent over the course of a 15-month period out of the fund program and for the very purpose for which we appropriated it and drop it in to GRF. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Fiscal Note attached from the Illinois Department of Transportation alone shows that the total loss in funds with IDOT interest would be million dollars. The highway program would be reduced by \$650 million dollars over five years as a result of fund balance loss in the Road and Construction Fund. While we may all agree with what the Sponsor is trying to do, I'm not sure we can agree in all good faith and conscience that the way to do it is what he has proposed. For that reason I would ask your opposition to House Bill 1297."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. You know, as we're looking for dollars in...in the state to operate the State of Illinois and we look at all these special funds with the big balances they have, and...and it takes the General Assembly to appropriate these funds, it would seem to me that many times we have created agencies and special funds that are...that are overabundant for what are necessary to...to work with that department. So, as we're looking for...for funds, I...I think this is a very appropriate move at this time this...this year when

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

we're...when we're looking for those state dollars. I might remember...remind Members that the downstate caucus, this is one of the issues that we talked about and is one way to alleviate our budget problems, and I ask for support of Representative Hicks' Bill, 1297."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Churchill: "Representative Hicks would you please tell me is the State Employees' Deferred Compensation Plan Fund in this?"

Hicks: "I...I'm not sure, Representative. I'd have to get the list. I believe I remember reading it was."

Churchill: "Alright. So, in other words, if the Members of this Body put money in the Deferred Compensation Program and other state employees put money in the Deferred Compensation Program and your Bill were to go into law, all that money would be taken out of that plan?"

Hicks: "No, Representative. What I have said from the day one, when I first presented this Bill in committee, and what done in discussions with many agency...many people been...I've said that dollars that are dedicated...dollars that are there and needed within programs are dollars we should leave in those programs. Dollars that are excess in those programs, dollars that are not needed to meet our obligation, those are the dollars we ought to be looking at. You know, originally we...the original...review of this Bill said that there were \$530 million dollars in those funds, and in actuality there were. Without the Road Funds, and those...that was originally in all of the explanations of the Bill as it was proposed. But, what we've said in reality, maybe we can find \$50 million, maybe we can find \$100 million of dollars

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

that aren't being used, that aren't needed within those funds, and those are the dollars that we ought to go to. That's what I have, and I intend to do with this legislation is look at each one of those programs individually, ensure those funds...programs are funded properly, that we aren't taking the money away from the programs that is not needed, take the excess funds and balance this budget that we have, Representative."

- Churchill: "Well, that's...that's nice philosophy, but who makes that choice?
- Hicks: "I think we make that choice right here in this Legislature."
- Churchill: "So, in other words, but, if we pass this Bill today, there is nothing that says that the State Employees Deferred Compensation Plan won't be touched. You vote 'yes' on this Bill, the Deferred Compensation Plan could be taken over, and the people's contributions into that plan could be taken into the General Revenue Fund. I mean, don't tell me philosophy. That's what happens if you vote for this Bill. If you have deferred compensation..."
- Hicks: "Representative, you make it out to be what you want it to be. I...you make it out to be what you want it to be, Representative, but the bottom line is, we've got a problem in this state. We've got money sitting in checking accounts. We have money sitting in funds that you and I both know could be used to take care of the education of the school kids of Illinois, and I believe it's time that we did something about it."
- Churchill: "How about the State Pensions Fund? Does this Bill take the money from the State Pensions Fund?"
- Hicks: "Representative, I can't answer that. I...I don't have the book in front of me that tells me what those 144 funds were."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Churchill: "Alright. Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I can't answer it because I have a list in front of me of all of the different funds that this Bill affects, and I'll tell you that what this says is that if you have money that you put into the State Employees Deferred Compensation Program, that those dollars are in jeopardy if you vote for Bill. If you have money that you put into the State Pensions Fund or any of your constituents put in the State Pensions Fund, those moneys are jeopardized if you pass this Bill. If you have moneys that you put into the Nuclear Safety Emergency Preparedness Fund or the Environmental Protection Trust Fund or the Domestic Violence Shelter and Service Fund, or the State Police Services Fund, or the Criminal Justice Information Fund, on and on and on. All of the separate funds that we have established to make sure that there are dedicated sources of revenue that go to solve dedicated problems that we face in this state are affected by this Bill. This Bill is dangerous. It is not something that we should pass at this point. If Representative Hicks wants to come back and refine this and talk about specific funds, that ought to be the approach, but this shotgun approach is not going to work, and you're going to create more danger with this Bill than you can ever solve."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion. The Gentleman from McDonough...McDonough. Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giqlio: "He indicates he will."

Edley: "...tax...have...have you, removed the Road Fund from this Bill?"

Hicks: "Representative Edley, I...from the very beginning I described this Bill as the 144 funds listed starting after

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Education...starting after the Road Fund. It was never my intent to put the Road Fund in this Bill. If...I've said that the intention of the legislation is that the Road Fund be out of this Bill. I've said it from the very beginning, and I will ensure by the time we finish with this Bill, and I think it has much merit, and I believe it will be much discussed, that the Road Fund will not be in the Bill."

- Edley: "Is it your intention to include the...the other funds here, not to strip them of the money that they need or may have obligated for expenditures out of that fund, but to look for idle balances to where the expenditures out of the fund...or when the fund balances greatly exceed the...the obligation of the fund?"
- Hicks: "That's absolutely right, Representative. We are looking for those balances that are not being used, that we see no...no possibility of those funds being used in future years, nor have they been used in past years. We've said from the very beginning that those funds that...have an ongoing balance that is a continual...some of those funds for as long as 20 years we've seen a balance in those of several million dollars that...in no year have we ever seen those funds be used that we should be taking that money, and that is the intent."
- Edley: "Isn't it true that many of these funds before they were established...the revenues that are now dedicated to those funds went into the General Revenue Fund?"
- Hicks: "Absolutely, Representative. Just a few years ago, and we've seen over the last four or five years, more and more people are going looking for dedicated dollars and taking dollars away from the General Revenue Fund. I think it's time that we make those tough decisions of setting priorities in this state, and I think that every time that we here legislate special funds, we're...we're taking the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

priorities of school kids, the priorities of the...the needy, and we're taking that and changing that...priority, and so every time we go home and say to people, 'Education is a priority to us,' we're lying to those people when we do this."

Edley: "To the Bill, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Edley: "Speaker...I think that we're only doing what any prudent business would do. You know, we hear all...all the time from our constituencies, the Governor's...the government should be more efficient and should act more like a business. I look at this as...as a business person, If...if you had departments that were generating funds and expending moneys, on a periodic basis you would go through departments and through those funds...dedicated funds...and sweep them of excess balances. literally hundreds of special funds that the state provides revenue for. That revenue source and that revenue growth may not match up with the expenditures that are demanded from that fund and consequently you get excess balances arising. I'm going to give you just one fund that I looked at was the Real Estate Recovery Fund in which we have a current balance exceeding \$2 million dollars, and since that fund was established in the early 1970s over the 16 years, the total expenditure from that fund...total over those 16 years, cumulative expenditures was about \$1.4 million dollars. In other words, we've got almost \$20 million dollars in....20 years funding with that \$2 million dollars that we have in that fund. There's no reason that the state should allow that to happen, and for that reason I support the Members sponsoring this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

- Hultgren: "Representative, there seems to be some confusion.

 I've been listening to the discussion as to exactly which funds are included. My question is, 'Would you be willing to hold this today, amend it with a specific list of the funds so that there's no confusion as to which funds we're talking about?'"
- Hicks: "Representative, I...I believe...when I discussed this Bill in the committee I made reference to the 144 special funds starting off with the Education Fund in the Budget Book and...and listing those 144 special funds as they are defined in the Budget Book. I think it is very definitive on what those funds are. That is the intent of the legislation, is to start with those 144 funds and only entail those 144 funds. DOT is out of the Bill. They aren't in the Bill. Education funds are not in the Bill. They're out of the Bill. Those 144 funds specifically are the ones that I'm talking about. I...I don't know how I can be any more clearer with intent, Representative, than that."
- Hultgren: "Well, in fact, that's...that's my question. If...if
 those 144 funds are your intent, rather than simply making
 that a matter of legislative record in the committee and a
 matter of record here on the floor...can...do...do you
 object to amending the Bill to enumerate those funds so
 that some of the confusion which obviously exists could be
 eliminated?"
- Hicks: "Representative, I guess I would say to you that if I'm successful in passing this Bill, I will ensure that the Senate Sponsor does exactly that. I will ensure that it will not come back to this House without that being out of it, and it will have to come back to this House. I will

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

ensure the Senate Sponsor does not move that Bill...until that specifically is spelled out if you have a problem with that."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair. Has this Bill...has this Bill been amended? Has this Bill been amended?"

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, is there any Amendments on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Amendments have been adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "No Amendments, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we need to halt our Weaver: attention here very briefly. According to the Department of Transportation, they are still in this Bill. The Bill has not been amended. As of this morning DOT was still in this Bill, and let me tell you what the effects are going to be. Any money that they have not spent within the specified time limit automatically reverts to GRF. of you that have road projects on the five-year plan in your district, it's going to kill them. You will not have any road construction past the time limits of this Bill because DOT is still in there. Also, in there, are local motor fuel tax dollars. Also in there are veterans dollars. We're eliminating by one...one sweeping move of all of the programs that we have specified in the past that we need money for. Now I'm not against doing this on a program-by-program basis. As a matter of fact, I sponsored a Bill, 1136, it does just exactly that. It takes the unused money out of a...a fund called the Prairie State 2000 Fund and puts it into General Revenue.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

we ought to do that, but we ought to consider it on a program—by—program basis so that we don't in one fell swoop eliminate all the programs that we may need in...in the future. I think probably it's a good idea if we go about it the right way as...as Representative Hultgren has mentioned. Let's identify the funds. Let's specify where they're coming from and where the money is going to go and what the intent is. I think right now we ought to halt action on this Bill until we get some more specific answers, and Mr. Speaker, I request a Roll Call vote on this Bill.

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn...Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this fine piece of legislation. We've been talking around here all spring about our financial crisis, in the State of Illinois, and we have, until moment. overlooked those funds which are especially designated. The taxpayers out there don't see the difference between them and the General Revenue Fund. they know is that money comes out of their pockets to those taxes the same as the income tax they pay and the sales tax they pay. What they want is for us to fiscally responsible and to begin to address our problems. proposed which are way too deep in Human Services. potential for this legislation is to equalize the pain. it will be painful. Everything is going painful, this spring. When everything is painful, nothing should be overlooked. This is the valuable source of income for our State Treasury, in this time of need. We support a better piece of legislation this could not spring. I urge everyone in this chamber to vote 'aye' on this good piece of legislation, and I commend the Sponsor

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

for introduction of this legislation. It is one of the best pieces of legislation that I have seen in many, many years. I ask every one to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks, to close."

- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Hicks: Every day, here on this House floor, we hear about being fiscally responsible, about the needs of children, needs of the needy in this State, the about the underserved, and yet, pieces of legislation go through here every year that take more and more dollars away from us being able to set those priorities of spending. I think that we've seen that over...at least wise, the nine I've been here, we've seen that happen many, many times. Suddenly, I see, we're already up to 144 special You know, serving on Appropriations, Dedicated dollars. every time that I see somebody come in, and they me, 'Larry, we need 10 more positions, but they're non-GRF money. This is our money; let us spend our money.' I give it to you, that it is not their money to spend. It's up to you and I to be making those decisions here this General Assembly; it's what we're elected to do. ought to put all the money in GRF, every dime of it, and be able to make those hard choices right here in this General I ask every one of you to vote green on this good piece of legislation."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1297 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. This is final action. The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Robert Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, I think Representative Hicks is on to something very worthwhile here. The potential is great, but, I cannot support this legislation until I know, specifically, which funds and I

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

don't want to wait for the Senate, Ι have to know, specifically, which funds we're talking about. Ιn instances, I'm sure there is money there that we can use. Other instances, somebody mentioned pensions a while it wasn't fully answered. I'd hate to think at the time when we're talking to our AFSCME union people and we're asking for 59 million in takebacks, that we're also going to let them know we transferred their pension money to someplace else. You talk about mail, they'd hand carry, every individual would hand carry every letter down here. This is a good thought, it should not die here today, but it should not advance until it's more detailed. 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, somebody, earlier on, said that this is a dangerous Bill. If this Bill is so dangerous, you know, when we were in our recession in the early '80s, allowed...Governor Thompson to dip into these special funds, and the fact of the matter is, I think that the ordinary taxpayer would think it's a matter of lunacy, that...at a time when we are fiscally constrained, here we have funds laying around. I think that the average, ordinary taxpayer would say, 'Hey, it's all money; it's all our taxpayers' money. You people have been elected there to determine what the priorities are. What's so dangerous about that? If you can't vote for this, then you have no confidence in yourself in maintaining what the priorities in government are.' I think, especially in these fiscal times, this is a good Bill, should have been done long ago. We had Bills to do this 15 years ago, or more, and we should've done it then. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Novak."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

"Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. think this concept is generally laudable. For over the years we've accumulated excess funds in a various number of agency budgets and special fees, and the...gentleman that occupies the Governor's Chair on the second floor, I'm certain that if he could find extra money in the budget to help to pay for our critical human services' needs, I think this would be a wise choice to look at some of these funds. What some of the previous speakers indicated, the Gentleman from McDonough County, talked about excess funds and how it applies to local businesses and...prudent business people. I think the state government should, also, take a hard look at this. This is...this is sort of an unorthodox look at the way we can transfer funds into the General Revenue Funds to pay some of our Bills. I think it's that really needs a lot of scrutiny and a lot of close look to see where we can come up (sic-with) to find some dollars. If we can come up with 25 million, if we can come up with 50 million, if we can come up with 75 million, it may help us to pay off some of these bills...that we have been incurring over the last several months. So. least need to get this up a little bit higher so we can keep this debate going. I think it's a very crucial issue, and this Legislature should not put this by the wayside and shelve this. We need to discuss this more and more, and in more depth, to get to where we want to go to, and I if you can find some of these excess funds that do not hurt all these entities that benefit by these excess funds, we should be able to transfer these funds over to GRF. Ιt shouldn't hurt anyone. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Laurino in the Chair.

Representative Harris, you have one minute to explain your vote."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, did not hear you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not to belabor the point, it does not look like the Bill's going to get sufficient votes, but the Gentleman has an excellent idea; he really does. problem is, he uses too broad a brush, it seems to me, think that's why there's 52 'no' votes up there. We. here, in the General Assembly, and in the House, and in the Senate, created these special funds. We did it. What ought to do is look at them, individually, one at a time, and undo what we did, because the Gentleman's right, there's probably a lot of dollars out there that we can pick up to help education and to help some of our other needed state services, but when you take all of those special funds, many of which received federal specifically for a specific item and cannot, by law, be transferred into General Revenue because they come from the Feds, such as the veterans, special fund for Veterans' Homes, which is funded heavily by the Federal Government. When..."

Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close. Thank you.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all...Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that everyone recognizes what's actually going on here. These are funds that will have lapsed by September 30th; these are lapsed funds that we cannot touch and the agencies cannot touch. This is lost money, and I think people don't understand that with just listening to speeches being made for political press release purposes, rather than understanding what's really going on. What we're trying to do is approach money that we don't have access to at this point, and, besides that, all of us realize this is just one step along the process. There is no danger of the Retirement

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Funds being attacked, or anything like that, and everybody knows that. This is one step along the process so that we can more closely look at those funds which we do not have access to because they have lapsed in the department; does not have access to because they have lapsed. At a minimum, what we should do is put enough votes up here so we can put this Bill on Postponed Consideration."

- Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir. Representative Hicks."
- Curran: "At a minimum, what we ought to do is put enough votes up here so we can put this Bill on Postponed Consideration and move something through the process that every, single one of us knows needs to be done. There's no sense money being wasted sitting empty in some...in some fund. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hicks. One minute to explain your vote, Sir."
- Hicks: "Mr. Speaker, would you put the Bill on Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Laurino: "Postponed Consideration. The Gentleman wishes the Bill to be put on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1365, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. House Bill 1696, Representative Kulas. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act to create the Hydroelectric Power Utilization Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to bring the Bill back to Second for an Amendment."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second using the Attendance Roll Call. The Bill will be moved back to Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kulas."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 is a clarification Amendment. It changes the definition of 'municipal wholesale rate' to clarify that this rate is the sum of the general service's charges typically applicable under a utility's filed rate sheet, excluding riders, to the municipality in which the limited producer is located, and it excludes the rates chargeable for street lighting and pumping services, and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Kulas moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1696. Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act to create the Hydroelectric Power Utilization Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1696 creates the Hydroelectric Power Utilization Act, and it amends the Public Utilities Act. It provides that electric utilities shall purchase electricity generated by limited producers of electricity at the municipal wholesale rate. Basically, the Bill would require that utilities purchase energy produced from a municipally owned or controlled hydroelectric project at the wholesale rate charged by the utility to the local municipality. These rates are considerably lower than the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

utilities' residential rates and would not jeapordize or increase the electrical rates for the citizens of Illinois. In fact, we've set precedence for this rate. In the past, we passed a local Southwaste Disposal Act, which was passed in 1988, to encourage the generation of electricity from solid waste and landfill gases. In this legislation, the utilities would be required to buy electricity from the solid waste and landfill gas electrical generated projects, at the local municipalities' wholesale rate. All we're doing here is asking that the same law be applied to hydroelectric power. I'11 glad be to answer any questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1696.

Any further discussion? Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hydroelectric Power is a good It's probably one that we should have utilized greater, 20 years ago, 40 years ago. At this time, I'm not sure that I can agree, however, that we should subsidizing hydroelectric power when it's going to cost us more. I'm not sure that we should be subsidizing the kinds of power that we have right now, but that's not the issue of the Bill. The Bill is that currently, we have to buy whatever hydroelectric power is created, at three times the cost of generating power otherwise. Ιf competitive, if it were even-up, it might be a good idea, but to say that we have to pay for the subsidies that for hydroelectric power in this utilization Bill, doesn't strike me as a good idea. In addition to which, why are we now out inof the business of setting rates for utilitiy companies? I thought that's what the Commerce Commission was supposed to do. Why are we called upon to do Hydroelectric power may be a good idea. I border on two rivers; I would like to see it happen, but I don't want the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

people who are buying electricity today, to be forced to pay for the subsidies in order to develop hydroelectric power. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this an excellent legislation, and I think I can speak from experience. The City of Kankakee received a grant of 1.4 million dollars to construct the hydroelectric dam on the City of Kankakee, along the Kankakee River. That hydroelectric plant is not yet complete, yet, but should be on line pretty soon. The 1.4 million dollar grant they received, to relate this to the previous speaker, was from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources through a bonding authorization fund. the State of Illinois is in the business of subsidizing alternative energy sources, and this is one of hope, the City of Kankakee hopes, to save \$300,000 over the next few years in its utility costs, by generating power for its Metro Waste Water Utility Program that provides sewage treatment to four communities in our metropolitan area. This is one of the fine examples of, I think, we can do in the State of Illinois, by encouraging more hydroelectric power as an alternative to what energy sources that we use now, and I ask you for your support for this legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Ackerman." Ackerman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I believe this Bill needs a little more work for House. it. I do not rise in opposition to it. I think definitely a very good idea, but there's some inconsistencies between the federal regulations and the proposed state regulations, especially as to the price that...utilities might have to pay for it. So, at

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

time, I'm going to have to be voting 'present' on it."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the last speaker. I think that basic concept of this Bill is a good one, but it's not here yet in terms of what it does. In addition to the potential inconsistency with federal law, in terms of the rate of reimbursement...we have a unique problem in Illinois in that. unlike states like California...we have substantial excess capacity. We don't need more electricity at The consumers, the business community is being point. required to pay for that excess capacity. In four or years, the projections are that excess capacity will be down. At that point, we can use some of the extra electricity that this legislation would bring in. I think what we need to do is to put a delayed effective date this legislation. That way, the utilities that currently are in opposition, I think a lot of their concerns will dealt with. Currently, the consumer groups that don't have position could support this legislation. The concept is a fine one, but it's at this point, not there yet in terms of being in a position that I can vote 'aye' for, and I, too, plan to vote 'present'."

Speaker Laurino: "Any further discussion? Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. The previous speaker indicated that maybe it'd be four or five years before we'd need the power that's generated through hydroelectric power generation. I have three communities in and around my district: Kankakee, Marseilles and Chanahon, all that have hydroelectric programs that are now under construction, or, planned. This is exactly the type

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

of legislation that they need to put markets in place, and, yes, this legislation will help them put markets in place in four to five years when the power would be needed. We can't wait until it's needed before we provide and plan for the future. These plants will be in place, in four or five when we need this additional energy. legislation will help those plants provide the markets and have the markets for an environmentally sound, clean source of energy. If you're looking for ways to reduce our dependence on imported oil and reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy, this is one of the opportunities we have. I urge an 'aye' vote and ask an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman from McClean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Ropp: "Representative Kulas, I'm sorry I was off the floor when,
I think, you amended this Bill. Would you briefly tell me
what the Amendment does to this Bill, now?"

Kulas: "Yes, Representative Ropp. Basically...Amendment #3 was at the request of the...municipalities. It changed the definition of municipal wholesale rate, to clarify that this rate also includes the riders and excludes rates chargeable for street lighting and pumping services. This is at the request of Municipal League."

Ropp: "The question that some have raised about the fact that current public utilities can purchase this power, and even manufacture it, at maybe two or three cents now, and under this proposal the power would cost us more. What is your response to this added cost to potential consumers?"

Kulas: "Well, there's a...you've all received sheets from Commonwealth Edison Utilities, saying that this will

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

increase costs for the residential consumers. If you look at the numbers, if everything that Edison says is true, which everything isn't, let's say, for argument's sake, that all their arguments are valid...If...even if all their arguments are valid, the costs would be 15¢ per year per customer. 15¢ a year."

- Ropp: "Well, that doesn't sound like very much, but when the telephone rate went up 15¢ for one month, we got an awful lot of calls, not too long ago. Okay, I understand what you're attempting to do, and...appreciate your efforts."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this fine piece of legislation...this Bill may cost more in the short run, but it will avoid the necessity of more and more very costly and dangerous nuclear power plants, possibly, in the future. clean, unexhaustible hydroelectric power can, and should be, our future. In fact, I think in the future this Bill will save the taxpayers tremendous amounts of money, and for all those that have minor problems with this legislation, I think it's important that we send a clear signal that things like hydroelectric power are the future. I think that these minor discrepancies differences can certainly be worked out in the future, and I would encourage people on both sides of the aisle to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Matijevich: "One second, we have to make an announcement,

 Myron, hold on. Representative Lou Jones, for an
 announcement?"
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Reapportionment Committee will meet at 12:15 in Room 114. I expect all the Members to be there. Thank you."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, we have leave of the Body for the Reapportionment Committee to meet in Room 114 at 12:15 while the House is in Session. (We don't need leave; that's been part of the Rules, now). Alright. Thank you. The following Members will be excused from voting while the Reapportionment Committee is meeting: Representative Lou Jones, Representative Currie, Giorgi, LeFlore, Martinez, Santiago, Satterthwaite, Stern, Tony Young, Wyvetter Younge, Representative Parcells, Burzynski, Cowlishaw, Deuchler, Kubik, Leitch, Myron Olson and Ropp, and now, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson, on this Bill."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: \$ Representative Kulas, to close."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to get a Roll Call before these people leave for the meeting. Basically, you've heard a lot on the Bill. The arguments on excess capacity are not valid because the state will need excess capacity. The arguments on cost are not valid because even if everything was true, it's only 15¢ per year. The other arguments, that there should be a...delayed effective...date, also, are invalid, because it would take 7 years to get...something on line from the day we pass this legislation. Therefore, I ask you to support a good Bill for clean air, for power for the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas has moved for the passage of House Bill 1696. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry. We prematurely locked the board, so we're going to have to take another Roll Call. We locked those Members out who were going to Reapportionment, so we're going to have to...we'll dump this Roll Call and have another one.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Phelps has moved for the House Bill 1891. Is there anybody in passage of opposition? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1891 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted Clerk...Roll. Clerk will take the record. this question, there are 103 'ayes', 1 'nay', 105 'ayes', 1 'nay', and House Bill having received 1891 the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1930, Wyvetter Younge, out of the record. Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 2050, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, no, out?...return House Bill 2050 to Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo on Amendment #4."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #4 simply is technical in nature and cleans up what was intended by Amendment #3 in terms of the appointments to the Advisory Council that are made by the Governor. I would move, Mr. Speaker, for the adoption of Amendment #4."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Gentleman asks leave to hear the Bill on Third Reading. He has leave. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. Third
 Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo on House Bill 2050." Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill 2050 as amended, does two things. First of all, it gives the Governor two new appointments to the Advisory Council of the Department on Alcohol and Substance Abuse, one of whom must be a representative of a manufacturer or importing distributor of alcoholic liquor, licensed by the State of Illinois. DASA is neutral on that provision. They had been opposed to that. They are neutral on that provision, with the way this is worded. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the Bill also allows one further appointment by each member, each leader of the General Assembly by the Attorney General and by the Comptroller. That's what the Bill does. I would answer any questions that the Members might have, Mr. Speaker, if not, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call...Mr. Speaker, could I take the Bill out of the record, please?"

- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 2078, Representative Churchill. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2078, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Churchill on House Bill 2078."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2078 incorporates, in it, also, House Bill 2079, which basically does two things now: It provides that public grants and private gifts which have been accepted by the Department of Human Rights and the Human Rights Commission, should be reported in accordance with the State Officers and Employees Money Disposition Act, and it also provides that the department may transfer charges to a federal agency which has the jurisdiction to resolve such charges by agreement between the state and Federal Government."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Churchill has moved for the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

passage of House Bill 2078. Is there any question? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2078 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 95 'ayes', 5 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 2078 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We'll return to Representative Steczo on House Bill 2050. Leave of the Body with use of the Attendance Roll Call to hear House Bill 2050. Leave. Read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 became the Bill, or, the proper form of the Bill, and, just to reiterate what it does, it adds two gubernatorial appointments, one of whom must be a representative of a manufacturers or importing distributors of alcoholic liquors, licensed by the State of Illinois. DASA is neutral on that position and provides extra appointments by the legislative leadership and by two state elected officials."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved for the passage of House Bill 2050. On that the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will, proceed."
- Black: "Representative. I can understand the Attorney General, or his or her designee, but could you add...enlighten me as to why we want the State Comptroller on this committee?"
- Steczo: "Representative Black, the reason the State Comptroller is...is has an appointment is because the current

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Comptroller, Dawn Netsch, was a member of the DASA Advisory Council, or its predecessor, since its inception, 16-17 years, and there's still a big interest in...pursuing the activities of the council. So, as a gesture we would like to have her included."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2050 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk...will take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 2050, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill Currie? Currie do you want the Bill...2486...No. Out of the record. House Bill 2502, Cronin. Out of the Alright. The Committee on Reapportionment, their switches are now locked, or will be. On the Order of Insurance, Third Reading. House Bill 1603, Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 2105, Balanoff. Insurance. Balanoff? Out of the record. Occupational Health Hazard Fund. Out of the record. On the order of Municipal County and Conservation Law, Second Reading, 1537, Marinaro. Out the record. 2149, McGann. On Second Reading. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading, Municipal, and Conservation Law appears House Bill Brunsvold. Out of the record. House Bill 705, Out of the record. 763, Lou Lang. 763, Cook County Officers Bill. Alright. Read the Bill. 763."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 763, a Bill for an Act to amend the County Code. Third Reading of the Bill"
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 763 is just a shell

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill for Cook County. There's nothing in it now. I don't know what's going to be in it, but I'd like to get it in the Senate so I can do something for the County of Cook over there, and I ask the passage of House Bill 763."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 763. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 763 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little late on my switch. I would have liked to ask the Gentleman a question. I thought we had talked about some of these Bills this morning. I thought you were going to extend the deadline, Representative, or do you want to move these now, or extend the deadline on those three Bills?"

Lang: "When I was talking about extending the deadline it was some other Bills."

Black: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will...take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang. Postponed Consideration. Leave for Postponed. The Bill will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. 764. record. 794, Representative Hartke. Out of the 833, Brunsvold, out of the record. record. 872, Representative Turner. 872. Group Home Anti-Discrimination. Out of the record. 1479, Steczo. 1920, Giorgi. Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2342, Phelps. Out of the record. 2342, out of the record. Public Utilities, Third Reading, Representative Turner on 244. Out οf the record. Representative Deering on 992, out of the record. Representative McNamara on 1392. Read the Bill. 1392."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1392, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1392 amends the Public Utilities Acts and it requires the public utilities to report all power outages having the duration of a certain period of time and if the customers suffer, to take a look atthe review of that. It had been amended so that we took a look at the actual records of the last 20 years Commonwealth Edison, and we took a look and based a formula on that look-see, and that formula was 65% was a cutoff area. What that meant was that if the power outages exceeded that figure and...which would have occurred 4 times in the last 20 years, that the ICC would then look at the management audit for the public utilities companies, and what they would do then would be to report to the public precisely...how good or bad it was, what the conditions were, et cetera. Also on this Bill. Representative Cowlishaw's...figure which is...tagged onto...in order to...the municipalities. Those municipalities that run their own power sources, what they do, is, they will be required to report on the same reporting basis. The reason for this is very simply Representative Cowlishaw's areas, many others of across the state, there are excessive...blackouts. are trying to do is focus on what the causes of those I do not see this as anything blackouts are. that is...against the power utility company, but I believe that we have a right to take a look at those blackouts and what has happened to them and...to inform the people. happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

passage of House Bill 1392 and on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will, proceed."

McCracken: "In any...portion of the Bill, is the frequency rate of 65% defined, and, I don't mean the number, but, I mean, how do you define this, so that a utility or the Commerce Commission would know that there should be a report filed?"

McNamara: "The way we have defined it in the Bill was, is we took the formula of the power company of Commonwealth Edison. Commonwealth Edison replied to a case, and the case was ICC Docket 90-0169, on April 13, 1990. They reported for the last past 20 years, and that frequency rate was designed...was defined as the total system. KVA interrupted, over the total system connected, KVA, and that the ICC when I was talking with them, were in favor of that particular definition because it afforded some sort of an equilibrium across all of the utility companies, so we're not getting different figures in, so I took their definition."

McCracken: "Alright. For a layman, let me ask this. Does the 65% frequency figure mean that at any given time, in an outage, or no...let me take that back. Does it mean that 65% of the time there were...failures?"

McNamara: "In...in reality, I can't tell you that. There are power outages, due to work on the system. There are power outages due to the acts of God, there were...any power outage of any source."

McCracken: "And, would the acts of God go toward calculating the 65% figure?"

McNamara: "That's correct, because...."

McCracken: "Would...would the maintenance, or whatever you referred to, just previous to that, would that, also, go

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

into the 65%?"

McNamara: "That's correct. The reason for doing that was that it gave a 100% coverage of the utilities, so that did not have to install new minute meters to determine, at the time of the power outage, precisely what caused that, and, it's over a year's period of time. So, what it does, is it allows them to, then, when the management audit, if it exceeds a certain amount, comes in, it can define, there nothing punitive in this. It can define that the power outage is due to squirrels, due to a tornado, due to whatever."

McCracken: "Well, typically, that...those causes would not be the total cause, would they? Typically?"

McNamara: "This takes in all causes."

McCracken: "But, my point is, what is the importance of the information, for example, that some portion of the 65% was due to maintenance? Do we all agree that some has to be as a result of maintenance? Is that unavoidable?"

McNamara: "That's unavoidable that some, maybe, okay. If they had a 100% of a system and came out with a 65 or greater percentage, as far as being out is concerned, if they had that type of an outage, and it was due to tornadoes, et cetera, the management audit would point that out and indicate that that was the reason for the power outage."

McCracken: "If...if in fact, a substantial portion of the 65% were composed of maintenance and acts of God, would you propose changes relative to those causes? I mean, I guess my point is, there are some reasons which are not going to point toward bad management, or inadequate capitalization, or deferred maintenance. Isn't that right?"

McNamara: "That's...that's absolutely correct."

McCracken: "So, to the extent those causes compose all or a portion of the 65% figure, it would make the audit

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

meaningless because those causes are not something we seek to correct."

- McNamara: "Not...not totally true because the audit would indicate, as to what causes were for those power outages. It would highlight the maintenance cost. It would highlight as to, what were the acts of God, et cetera. Plus, the other reason that it was done on a total system failure, so to speak, was because it was easier for the utility companies to...report those figures rather than make an analysis on the spot as to what was the exact cause and report it that column."
- McCracken: "Well, I'm trying to get a feel for what the 65% figure means to the average consumer. Can you tell me?

 Does 65% mean that 65% of the time the consumer's going to be without power?"

McNamara: "No."

- McCracken: "Can you give us, for a layman's benefit, something we can measure this by? What...why is the 65% threshold?"
- McNamara: "The reason the 65% threshold was put in there is to make it as palatable as possible in reporting data. Let me indicate something. On...of the reporting for the 20-year span of time, that was submitted to the court Commonwealth Edison, in that, they had frequency levels from 47% on up to 79%. Obviously, on a frequency level of 43%, we would certainly not want to audit that. We had to come out with a figure. What had happened was, I did not want these companies totally audited every single year as part of a harrassing technique, but I did believe the consumer had the right to know, and sort of to guide the utility company that if there is problem with maintenance, that would be highlighted. So, what I did was, as I took the average of the 20 years and came out with 61.4%. Then I said, that still allows for too many

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

outages and too many reports, so I raised that average to 65%, and that's how we came out with the 65."

McCracken: "Alright, well, thank you. I...confess, I'm an outsider when it comes to this business, but I still don't see any meaning to the 65% figure except it's a few points above a 20 year average. I don't really know what it means, except to say that, to the extent it's frequently attained, it will result in more paperwork for the utility, with what, I think, is not a demonstrated case of benefits to the consumer. We still don't know, as a practical matter, what the 65% means. Does it represent a...an an inconvenience factor, so to speak, to the consumer which justifies more regulatory paperwork and any associated with that. I'm not certain that the case has been mazed. I rise in opposition."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

- Churchill: "Representative. This requires a filing of a new report, is that c orrect?"
- McNamara: "In reality, they already file, as was testimonied in the committee hearing. They...already file these reports.

 It is also indicated by the court documents that these reports are filed with the ICC. Each and every year, they are already required to do so, so there is no new report, to my understanding."
- Churchill: "But, those reports are only filed upon request.

 They're not filed annually, as your Bill requires?"
- McNamara: "It is possible. I can't answer your question on that,
 whether it's done by request, but by the indication that
 they can file these reports, indicates that they already
 have the data."
- Churchill: "Or that, if they were requested to file a report,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

they would go back and...and dig up the data. They may not monitor this on an ongoing basis?"

- McNamara: "You're correct. They would not monitor it, nor would the ICC monitor it, on an ongoing basis. What the intent is, very simply, is that on the filing of the report, of the document, what it does for the ICC at the same time is, it allows for all utility companies to be filing the report on the same basic data. There is a formula within the Bill, so this helps them out, to understand precisely what the electric companies are giving them."
- Churchill: "Okay, so let's take...an example. Let's say, a car's going down the road. It hits a utility pole, knocks out service. It's out for a maybe a minute and a half, or two minutes, and then some other part of the system kicks in, so that the electricity comes back on in the system. So, the utility, then, has to maintain a record of that accident. Maintain a record of how long the service was off before it was re-establised, and that would be a part of the report that you're asking for?"
- McNamara: "It is based, on my understanding of what the committee hearing had brought out, is that those records are already kept for every minute of interrupted service outage. The reason that the original Bill, before it was amended, was so difficult was because it required them to report each incidental operation. This does not. This is the total. So, therefore, you don't have the extra expense of each time it happens, and say, well, it was out for two minutes due to a car wreck, or whatever. Those things could be determined sometime afterwards. It was a total, and that was done to make it easier for the utility companies."
- Churchill: "Okay, then...your Bill says that when there's been a service interruption for what, 65% of the time, is it? Or, is it 65% of the people under a utility's billing systems

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- are out of power? Where does the 65% kick in the management on it?"
- McNamara: "It's based on the total system, interrupted, divided by the total system connected. It is all interruptions added in over a period of a year."
- Churchill: "So, if one community of a thousand people is interrupted, but the total system is 5,000,000 people, you'll still have to report it?"
- McNamara: "Yes, in fact, Commonwealth Edison, I know for sure, keeps those records, as do all utility companies, I believe, across the State of Illinois, keep all of those records."
- Churchill: "Alright, then, a management audit...takes place if
 the 65% threshold is hit. Tell me, what does the
 management audit do?"
- McNamara: "All the management audit does is take a look at all of the reasons for those power outages. In other words, it can make exceptions, and that's all it does, and it allows to display that management audit for public consumption. So that people, when they are taking a look to see, as to...if utility...in reality, it gives the utility, in some cases, in cases of acts of God, et cetera, it gives them the excuse as to why those audits, or, why those power outages did occur. So in a way, it could have a very advantageous effect for the utility company."
- Churchill: "How...how expensive is the management on it?"
- McNamara: "I have no idea."
- Churchill: "But, it does cost something. You'll admit, there's some cost factor to the utility to do that?'
- McNamara: "Yes, and in my conversations with the ICC, they would be able to conduct such a management audit."
- Churchill: "And the cost of the management audit would then get added back into the rate base."

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

McNamara: "No, it isn't. That is the expense of the ICC."

Churchill: "Okay, so in other words, the state is paying for the management and it..."

McNamara: "Absolutely."

Churchill: "Okay, and then, tell me this, once we get all this data, how...how I mean, does this stop power outages? I just want to know, I understand what you're trying to do is stop power outages, and I'm trying to find out how your Bill gets to the point where it actually stops them."

McNamara: "Not correct. I'm not trying to stop power outages.

What I am trying to do is give an incentive to utility companies, to be aware that somebody is looking to determine that they are upgrading their systems, to the best systems that they can deliver that service, and all I'm trying to do is provide that incentive that, when people don't have the ability to take a look, or determine as to when a power outage is going to occur, at least in this case they will have the reason those power outages are so high."

Churchill: "I've just been handed a sheet from the Illinois Commerce Commission that says that's it's estimated that the additional cost would be around \$250,000 annually, to But, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I quess do these audits. the point has been made by Representative McNamara. intent is to offer an incentive for utility companies to do the best job that they can and not have power outages, and I think they already have that incentive. They don't need this incentive. This is a Bill that really is not necessary, but it's a Bill that increases the cost to the which is to the taxpayers of this state, and it's a Bill which increases the paperwork to the companies. after we go through all this extra layer of bureaucracy and paperwork and expense, we don't end up in any better

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

position than we are right now. So, I don't think there's any need for this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara, to close."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does, it's really a very common sense approach. It is not out to Commonwealth Edison or any other utility. or municipal utility, as far as that's concerned. What the Bill does, is, it monitors the power outage situation so that we can make sure that the people are protected, somebody is taking a look at that operation. We all know that Commonwealth Edison, and all other utility companies, are monitored companies that are going out to do a job to It is absolutely necessary that the provide service. public be protected in some way by having someone that is reasonable and who can take a look at what is causing power outages, so that corrections can be made. Without oversight, we will continue to keep systems on line that are probably obsolete, еt cetera. Representative the Cowlishaw. who offered Amendment for the municipalities, was absolutely correct because of the reason that the Northside and her community, the power outages that were there were horrendous. Something has to done. We all know about the power outages in Chicago; about them downstate. Lets...this is we all know something that is correct. beginning to do I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Balanoff, I believe you turned Mr. Trotter's light on. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 42 'ayes' and 30 'nos'. House Bill 1392, having failed to receive a Constitutional

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Majority is declared lost. Same Order of Business under Second Reading, appears House Bill 2342, Representative Phelps. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2342, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to use of Illinois coal. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps. Withdraws Amendment #2.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment pursues the same policy objectives as the original Bill, but it's much better. It reflects several weeks of negotiations with utilities. The original Bill provided local property tax relief. That is now out It requires, also, the Department of Energy, Co-Development Board to begin studies of markets for Illinois coal, included in an evaluation of the effects of the new Federal Clean Air Act, and, most importantly, and lastly, it requires that the Clean Air Act Compliance Plan, approved by the ICC for Illinois utility companies, should minimize adverse economic effects on the state. Essentially, that's the Bill, and we want to amend it, and

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- we're prepared for Third Reading, tomorrow's debate. We appreciate your favorable vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye', opposed ,'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
 and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Levin, House Bill 2488, out of the record. Real Estate, Second Reading. 909, Mr. Turner. Representative Turner, 909. Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 909, a Bill for an Act concerning the Management of Housing Projects. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "There's a Fiscal Note requested on this Bill.

 Representative Turner, I just want to remind you, there's a

 Fiscal Note requested that's not filed. Representative

 Turner."
- Turner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe a Fiscal Note is applicable to this Bill, and I'd...."
- Speaker McPike: "And, when the Reapportionment Committee is over, you'd like to make that Motion?"
- Turner: "Yes, Sir. I will."
- Speaker McPike: "1926, Representative Woolard. 1929,
 Representative Levin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1929, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed, and no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Wait a minute, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker. I've been negotiating with the Illinois

 Realtors on this legislation and I would ask, at this

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

point, to table Amendment #1, which would gut the Bill, and then we'll pass the Bill as a shell over to the Senate."

- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. The Bill is on Second Reading. The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Motions or Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Flowers? Real Estate Law. Third Reading. Representative Hicks, 136.
 Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 136, a Bill for an Act concerning liens
 upon commercial real estate. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take the Bill back to
 Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Leave granted? No objections. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks withdraws Amendment #2."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 to House Bill 136...takes care of agreements that were made...during the committee process...in the Amendment, it's quite lengthy. It does four basic things, though. It takes vacant land out of the Bill. It makes...that...the only way broker liens would be available, would be through written agreements whereby a

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

broker had a written agreement to sell a piece of property. It also takes care of problems that we had, that some Members had, with the escrow section of the Bill, and it also has a provision for extinguishing the lien in the event that no transaction occurs. I would be happy to try to answer any questions anybody has about the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "And, on the Amendment, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Parke: "Representative Hicks...is this an agreement with the Illinois Realtors now?"

Hicks: "Yes, it is. During...the...committee process...this Bill is a Bill that was put...in by myself for the Illinois Association of Realtors, and it's a Bill that...took a lot of work during the committee, took an hour and a half in committee, and a lot of promises were made, and with this Amendment, we're taking care of those promises that were made."

Parke: "Is the Community Bankers Association now in support of this legislation?"

Hicks: "The Community Bankers?"

Parke: "Yeah, were they...did they have any role in this at all?"

Hicks: "I don't believe...I don't know of them having any role in the Bill.

Parke: "Alright, so as for as you know, the Realators are okay with this?"

Hicks: "Yes, that's correct."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative Hicks."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Gentleman would ask leave to call the Bill at this time. Any objections? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries.

 The Bill's on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 136, a Bill for an Act concerning liens on commercial real estate. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill does create does the Real Estate Broker's Lien Act. We have taken care of all concerns that were expressed during the committee that was some hour and 45 minutes in which many people had questions. Representative Kirkland, Representative Homer, many people had questions. I believe we have taken care of all agreements that were made during the committee process. I would ask for passage of House Bill 136."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All 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 91 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 136 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair intends to call one Bill. Representative Steczo on 1479, and then our intention is to go to Appropriations. Municipal, County and Conservation Law. House Bill 1479, Representative Steczo. Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. No objections, leave's granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Last week when this Bill was debated, there was a lot of discussion regarding holes in donuts and property surrounded by park

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

districts and annexation by those. This Amendment deletes those provisions. So, it just leaves in the Bill, a small provision relating to where...maps are filed when property is annexed. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, have the Appropriation Bills been read a second time?"

Clerk Leone: "The Appropriation Bills have all been read a second time."

Speaker McPike: "Page 4 of the Calendar. Representative Olson.

Representative Olson, on House Bill 163. Mr. Clerk, the
Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 163, a Bill for an Act making Appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. When the Reapportionment Committee has met out of town, we have locked their switches. When they were in Decatur, Champaign, or wherever, we locked their switches. The switches will not be locked right now because the Members are currently in the Capitol. Mr. Clerk, open the Roll Call. Can you open the Roll Call? Dump the Roll Call. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps there was an explanation of this Bill, but if we're going to vote on Appropriation

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Bills, I'd like to hear something about...."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, that's the Chair's fault. We would like a very brief explanation of the Bill, and then, if you have any questions, Representative Dunn, feel free to ask them."
- Dunn: "I think all Members should take these Appropriation Bills very seriously. We're in a deep financial crisis in this state, and it would certainly be poor perception, in the very least, to just run Appropriation Bills out of here..."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn, the Chair has agreed with you.

 Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Take this out of the record, please."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 171, out of the record. House Bill 207, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "That's out of the record, as well."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 214,
 Representative Ryder. The Bill's been read a second time.

 Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 214, a Bill for an Act to making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As introduced House Bill 214, appropriates \$1, GRF, to the Department of Public Aid, for study of the cost of the federally mandated programs."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "The Gentleman Sponsor indicated, as introduced, this Bill appropriates \$1. I have no idea what it does now. So, if there's a dollar in it as a vehicle to Public Aid, it's probably alright but if there's something else in it, we

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

should know."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there's 102 'ayes' and 3 'nos'. House Bill 214, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 243, Representative Weaver. Do you wish the Bill called? Mr. Weaver, do you wish..."
- Weaver: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw my request for extension of the deadline and go ahead and move 243."
- Speaker McPike: "The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara, for what reason do you rise?"
- McNamara: "Just for point of inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes.
- McNamara: "On a previous Bill, House Bill 1392, prior to your decision to unlock the switches, I would have liked to have that...recalled again, based on your decision to unlock the switches at that time."
- Speaker McPike: "If you, or any Member would like to have their
 Bill called again, you should approach the Chair and give
 us a list. Right now, we're doing Appropriations Bills."
- McNamara: "I understand that, but, unfortunately, it did not receive enough votes for recall to consideration, so, therefore, there were not enough votes to do that. So, therefore, that is my request at this time."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, the Bill has been tabled. You have to file a motion to take the Bill from the table, Mr. McNamara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 243, a Bill for an Act making Appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Weaver: "Mr. Speaker, we've decided to take this out of the record, please."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 319, Madagin-Daniels. Mr. Ryder, do you wish this Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. There are no Motions filed and no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 319, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of...the Co-Sponsors of the Bill, this Bill, as introduced, appropriated \$11,757,700 GRF for the Fy '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the office of Attorney...Auditor General, and the only Amendment rearranged the line items, the amount remains the same."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 319, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 373, Representative Ryder. The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 373, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill would appropriate \$2 to the Board of Higher Education. It's just a Democratic vehicle Bill and I would appreciate your yes vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 89 'ayes', 18 'nos'. House Bill 373, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 376. The Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk? Representative Balthis, for what reason do you rise?"

Balthis: "My switch did not work on that last Roll Call. I wanted to vote 'present'."

Speaker McPike: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 376."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 376. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "No Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed, no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 376, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House again.

This appropriates \$33 to the state police. It's another

Democratic vehicle Bill, and I'd ask a 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' 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 Bill there's 77 'ayes', and 17 'nos'. House Bill 376, having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 378. Representative McGann. The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 378, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. House
Bill 378 is a vehicle for the State Board of Education
which was agreed upon in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 71 'ayes' and 24 'nos'. House Bill 378, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 384. Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 384, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 384 is a shell Bill for the state police. I'd ask for passage for House Bill 384."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Ryder, 'aye'. Representative Ryder, did you wish to vote? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Trotter, 'aye'. Take the record. On this Bill there's 75 'ayes' and 7 'nos'. House Bill 384, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 386. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 386, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This appropriates \$3 to CMS. It's a Democrat vehicle Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there's 72 'ayes' and 9 'nos'. House Bill 386, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 388. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 388, a Bill for an Act, making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This appropriates \$2 to CMS, and it's my last vehicle
 Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 75 'ayes', 14 'noes'. House Bill 388, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 393. Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #3 adds \$244,000 for EDP equipment, and I'd move for its adoption. Yeah, this is non-GRF money, and I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on the 'do adopt' Motion, Representative Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Parke: "If it's not GRF money, where's it going to come from?"

Olson, R.: "Representative, we created a revolving fund...money that the Legislature has available to us now for this equipment, and it's not GRF money. It's like the Legislative Information Service when they sell some of this information to the private, part of that money comes to us for these purposes."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?

All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. This is just an LRB readjustment. There's no change in the line items and I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it

and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hanniq."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Hannig: "Yes. This Amendment would increase the...would increase
 our budget by \$11,000 for paper and printing costs, and I'd
 move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. On #6, again, it's just the Legislative Reference

 Bureau has suggested we make these changes to make the Bill

 flow better, but there's no change in the moneys, and I'd

 move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it

 and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, before you move this one to Third, it's my understanding from some of the Members that are on the floor that the Reapportionment Committee has now concluded their business and those Members are back on the floor. Is that your understanding, too?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "Okay."

- Speaker McPike: "House...Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr.

 Clerk. Representative Cowlishaw. Never mind. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 393, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies.

 Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 This is the ordinary contingent appropriation for some of
 the legislative support units, and the appropriation as it
 left Committee was for \$11,774,000. We've added a few
 \$100,000 on these appropriations...Amendments, and now I
 would ask that we pass the Bill and send it over to the
 Senate."
- Speaker McPike: "The question...Representative Olson on the Motion 'do pass'."
- Olson, R.: "I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion to pass."

 Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there is 113 'ayes', and no 'nays', and House Bill 393, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 394. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 394, a Bill for an Act making...no, there's no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 394, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Members of the General Assembly.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This is the ordinary contingent expense for the Members of the General Assembly. It's \$8,909,000, the same as last year's level, and I'd move for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there is 112 'aye', and 1 'no'. House Bill 394,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 395. The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 This adds \$80,000 in non-GRF money to the appropriations,
 and I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
 and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 395, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expenses of the General Assembly, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This appropriates \$23,167,700 for the ordinary contingent expenses of the General Assembly, plus the \$80,000 that we just added in non-GRF money. I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, Representative Granberg. Representative Olson."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Proceed."
- Olson, R.: "Representative Hannig, could you enlighten me on the Amendment again, please?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. That was \$32,000 to the Senate, and \$48,000 to the House, and that money came from the non-GRF Operation Revolving Funds."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- 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? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there's 100 'ayes' and 1 'no', and House Bill 395, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 505. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 505, Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted previously. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #5 is being offered by Representative Jay Hoffman. Amendment #3 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representatives Mautino and Saltsman."
- Speaker McPike: "3 lost in committee. Amendment #4,

 Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment does is transfer the seven positions that have been established under the Supreme Court...additional funding, and transfers them out into the Industrial Commission manpower provision. I think the change...there's no dollar change, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Amendment, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield, please?

Mautino: "Yes."

- Ryder: "Representative, apparently I was misled. I didn't quite understand the content of your...Amendment. This would be adding or subtracting dollars from this budget?"
- Mautino: "It moves the money. There's no...there's no dollar change."
- Ryder: "Then where is it that the funds...since you reallocate them tell us from where you took the money, and two, what line you wish to add the money."
- Mautino: "That's in another Bill. This one removes those positions. 651 is the other Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Ryder: "Alright. Well, I apologize. It may very well be a good idea, Representative. We were misled. I was told that you were not going to consider this Amendment at this time, and only because of that reason would I stand in opposition to your Amendment. I wish I had known about it, but since you plan to proceed with it and we were not instructed in that, I would stand in opposition."

Mautino: "I understand."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn."

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

Mautino: "Yes."

Dunn: "It is not especially noisy in here, but I thought I heard at one point in discussion of this Amendment that employees were being added to the payroll somewhere, and I thought I heard in another part of the discussion that they're being transferred. Will this legislation increase the state payroll?"

Mautino: "Well, in this budget, the amount that was added to the budget was around \$315,000, \$316,000 for these additional individuals in the Supreme Court. It was a suggestion of Representative Saltsman that the individuals...by number, I believe the number was seven, would be better served in the this budget, by \$317,000, and it will appear in the other budget in the same amount."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had some confusion, but I believe Representative Mautino just cleared it. This is not a transfer, but a reduction?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Olson, R.: "For the elimination of seven positions, is that..."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I reluctantly rise to oppose this Amendment, and understand that the Gentleman's trying to address a problem with the Industrial Commission's budget which we'll hear a bit later, but we provided that these Supreme Court Justices, in 1989 we, provided that they have these administrative aides. They're there, they're on the job, and I think that they're doing a good job for our Supreme Court. The courts are opposed to this Amendment, and I think that we should not put this Amendment on at this time, and if there's a problem with the Industrial Commission's budget, we should try to deal with that one, but I would ask that we vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm in favor of Amendment. I made a mistake back in 1989 when I voted to create these seven positions. We have found out through talking to people in the court system that they're really not needed, and we do know that we promised 30 new employees in the Industrial Commission which we did not appropriate money for. They were not hired, with their backlog, I think we should take these high-priced cab drivers...and put that money into the Industrial and put it where we can get some useful work Commission, So, therefore, this is a very good out of people. Amendment, and I ask for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. 'Ayes' have it.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Jay

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hoffman."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 would make a reallocation within court's budget. It would not change the bottom line of the court's budget at all, but in the original budget that came out of committee cut \$8,000,000, a little over \$8,000,000 from probation. The court has agreed to make transfers from various areas of the court's budget, not change the bottom line of their budget, and add \$2,600,000 into the probation area. These are people that would be losing their jobs, about 200 people throughout the state. I think it's incumbent upon the Legislature and incumbent upon us to protect the citizens of our districts to try and reinstate this \$2,600,000. It doesn't change the bottom line of the budget. It simply transfers within the court's budget."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Amendment, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to support the Gentleman's Amendment. It doesn't make any sense in an era when we cannot build additional correctional centers, in an era when we are not completing some work camps, to cut probation and parole to the bone. I think the Gentleman's got a good idea here. I wish we could put more money into it, and I hope everybody votes 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Simply rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a question, does this replace all of them that were taken out, or just a portion of 'em?"

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

"Over \$8,000,000 was taking (sic taken) out of the Hoffman, J.: probation budget. Approximately 240 probation officers throughout the state would lose their jobs under that budget. That would bring caseloads throughout the state way over 200 people...would be very ineffective. This...we still need to do more, but this, at behest courts...they're making a good faith effort at putting about 100 positions, I believe, approximately 100 positions would go back in because of this Amendment. I think we still have to do more down the line, but at this point, I think we have to stay within the means because of the budget situation. We can work on it down the line, but this Amendment, I believe, should be adopted for the safety of our citizens and the safety of the people who live in our district."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Matijevich?

Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 505, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 505 represents the ordinary and contingent
expenses of the Supreme Court and all the courts. As
introduced it was \$182,092,900, and the Committee reduced
that by \$12,041,700, and the further reduction by the
amount that we heard on the floor by Representatives

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Saltsman and Mautino's Amendment...I would now move the passage of House Bill 505."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hoffman, J.: "Yes."

Dunn: "Do you have available the personnel count actually on board for last year and the projected personnel for this year and...really two years ago is what I'm interested in.

Do you have those figures...for the Supreme Court?"

Matijevich: "Their requested new employees are 58 new employees,

Representative Dunn. I understand those are all taken out.

They're all out, so they're at the same level."

Dunn: "And what...I see the liaison is standard. What was the Supreme Court head count in the year before the one we're in now?"

Matijevich: "The administrative office, ballpark figure, is about 130 personnel."

Dunn: "And the year we're in now, is it above that?"

Matijevich: "They're staying at the same level."

Dunn: "And in this budget, is it being reduced?"

Matijevich: "No, the budget was reduced from its...original amount. We're \$2,000,000 over last year's..."

Dunn: "And how many people does that represent? That's the question. How many new people are going to be on the payroll at the Supreme Court?"

Matijevich: "There aren't going to be any new people. Most of that increase is mandated salary...salaries."

Dunn: "Alright. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Klemm: "Representative, is that amount of money requested this

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

 year, is it the same, or more or less than last year,

 because we don't really have a guide of how we're going,
- Matijevich: "It's about \$2,000,000 more than last year, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Are most of the departments taking cuts and the Supreme
 Court's going to get an increase during lean years?"
- Matijevich: "No, the problem is that you have mandated salaries that have to be paid, and that's what the...most of that \$2,000,000 represents, I understand."
- Klemm: "Alright. So this is more than it was last year by \$2,000,000? Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 101 'ayes' and 7 'noes'. House Bill 505, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Point of personal privilege. I wish the record to reflect an 'aye' vote on House Bill 395."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. The record will so reflect. House Bill 545. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 545, Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. There are no Motions or further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

unless we're..."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich in the Chair."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 545, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are the annual

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- appropriations for the Metropolitan Pier Exposition. \$4,800,000 for their ordinary and contingent expense...\$31,488,000 appropriation to pay the principal interest on outstanding bonds."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Capparelli has moved for the passage of House Bill 545. There being no discussion, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there are 106 'ayes', 3 'nays', 3 answering 'present'. House Bill 545, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5...Representative Deering is 'yes'...'aye' on the last Bill, and Representative Walsh, also. House Bill 581. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 581 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Further Amendments? Are there any Motions?"

 Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Hannig and Robert Olson."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hanniq."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This inserts a line number which was inadvertently omitted.

 It has no dollar amount. It's just a technical change, and
 I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig moves to the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'.

 The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 581, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino on House Bill 581." Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 581 is the OCE for the State Board of Elections. The original Bill as introduced was introduced at \$5,690,600. House Amendment #1, which was a reduction of \$200...excuse me, it was introduced at \$5,690,600. It passed the committee at \$5,228,700, which is a reduction of approximately \$500,000. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee, which reduced the operations by \$246,900, and took all those increases back to the Fiscal Year '91 estimated expenditures, with the exception of the printing of new election codes, publishing a...redistricting wall maps and booklets, and increasing the pre-election computer system testing and the grants by \$214,970. Amendment #2 was technical in nature, and I move for its passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino has moved for the passage of House Bill 581. The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Representative Mautino said rather lengthy, I'll make it more brief. There is about a half a million dollars in reduction here. I move for passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 581 pass?'

 Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 581, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 629. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 629 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. There are no Motions or further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 629, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prairie State 200 (sic 2000) Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$2,537,100 GRF for the 199...Fiscal Year '92 ordinary contingent expense...Prairie State 2000 Authority."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 629. On that, the Gentleman from Macon,
 Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Dunn: "When we have people in this state it appears are going to go without food, shelter, clothing, medical attention, wheelchairs, walkers, dental care, pharmacy services, podiatrist, chiropractic services, can we afford the Prairie State Authority?"

Ryder: "Representative, that's obviously a decision that each Representative will have to make for themselves as to how you..."

Dunn: "I thought I asked you."

Ryder: "...make a priority. I intend to support this legislation."

Dunn: "Alright. Just asking. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 629 pass?

Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 9 'nays', 4 answering 'present'. House Bill 629, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991 declared passed. House Bill 630. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 630 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Bob Olson and Gary Hannig."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Olson...Coles, rather."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 adds \$30,000 to the Environmental Protection Fund, to grant to the Pollution Control Board. It also makes language change to broaden the use of these funds for court reporting. This is an Agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 630, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from...who's going to handle it? Representative Olson on the Bill.
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 630 appropriates \$959,500, plus the \$30,000 we just amended on, for the Fiscal Year 1992 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Trust Fund. This is a reduction from last year's estimated expenditure of \$1,114,000. I move for passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 630. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

record. On this question, there are 106 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 630, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 631. Read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 631 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder, on Amendment 2."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates...or this

 Amendment would limit funding for sports lotteries to \$1.

 I move the adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay', and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 631, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Lottery. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder, on Amentment...House Bill 631.

Ryder: "Thank...No."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh. Representative Olson..."

Ryder: "That's Representative Olson's Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Olson has that one. Alright."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry for the confusion.

House Bill 631 appropriates \$432,622,000 to the '92

ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of the

Lottery. This is a reduction of...from \$433,218,000 last

year. I move for passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- passage of House Bill 631. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Did you say this budget is lower than the actual estimated expenditures for the fiscal year we're in?"
- Olson, R.: "That's correct."
- Dunn: "How much is it down? From..."
- Olson, R.: "About \$11,000,000, John."
- Dunn: "Now, not below budget, or not below introduction, but below last year's estimated expenditures?"
- Olson, R.: "Below last year's estimated expenditures."
- Dunn: "Alright, and what about the head count? Is it down also in the lottery?"
- Olson, R.: "John, I can't give you the number, but the answer is yes."
- Dunn: "And what about the advertising budget for the lottery, is it up or down, compared to last year's actual expenditures?"
- Olson, R.: "John, we're looking. I'm hoping it is, because I agree with you, it should be."
- Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, I think we have a response to that question. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, I hope I can be helpful, Representative Dunn. Last year, the estimated expenditures were \$433,000,218 (sic \$433,218,000). This year, we're appropriating by this Bill, \$432,300 (sic \$432,300,000)...300. We're down. Yeah, that's how it came out of committee, and that Amendment we put on it for \$2 is insignificant, so we've got a reduction from last year."
- Dunn: "You said that. Advertising. Is advertising up or down?"

 Speaker Matijevich: "The question is. 'Are we down in
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Are we down in advertising?' That's the question."
- Hannig: "Excuse...Representative Dunn, we're...Representative

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Dunn, we believe it's flat or below, but if you would like I would take this out of the record and get an answer for you."
- Dunn: "That'd be fine. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Out of the record. House Bill 632. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 632, this Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions, no further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 632, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Police Merit Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates \$703,900 GRF for the State Police Merit Board."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 632. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 106 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 632, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 633. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 633, this Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder on House Bill 633."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 633, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$1,484,800 of

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991
 which \$1,224,000 is GRF for the Human Rights Commission.
 Move adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 633. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. House Bill 633, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared. House Bill 634. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 634, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representatives Ryder and LeFlore."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment #2."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #1.

 Does he have leave? Leave. The Amendment is tabled.

 Representative Ryder on Amendment #2."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2...maintains the same bottom line on this appropriation as it came out of committee, but it does redistribute \$12,500 of cut that was made...and it makes those changes on three different lines."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to support what

 Representative Ryder has said. It's an Agreed Amendment,

 and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 634, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 634. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 'ayes', 1 'nay', and 1 answering 'present'. House Bill 634, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 635. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 635. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 635, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Local Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 635."

 Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 635 appropriates \$514,400 for Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Local Labor Relations Board. Last year, 1991 estimated expenditure is \$522,800. We're down some. I move for its adoption and passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 635. Those in favor signify by

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', House Bill 635, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 636. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 636, this Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 636, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Logan, Representative Robert
 Olson."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 636 appropriates the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor in the amount of \$4,423,300 for Fiscal Year 1992.

 This is a reduction from last year's estimated expenditure of \$4,565,300. I move for adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 636. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question about head count? Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates...yes."
- Dunn: "Can you tell me where head count is in the proposed budget and where head count is in the fiscal year in which we are right now?"
- Olson, R.: "Representative Dunn, the current actual head count is

 107. The budget year request allows for 101, a reduction
 of six."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 636 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- question, there are 103 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 636, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 637. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 637, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment's #1, 2, 3, and 8 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on Floor Amendment #9." Hicks: "Yeah. Withdraw."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 638. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 638, this Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 638, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Public Counsel. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 638."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 638 appropriates \$582,100 for the Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Public Counsel. It's estimated that the current fiscal year, actual expenses will be \$600,400,a reduction of roughly \$18,000. I move for its passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 638. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
 Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Recently, the Governor removed the long-term public counsel, and replaced the public counsel with an individual who has a very poor track record as far as representing consumers. I really question whether or not it's worth spending the money that is in this Bill to perpetuate what

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

is really a fraud. I plan on voting 'present' because we're better off without an agency that purports to represent the consumer, than one that says they represent the consumer and really does not. The person that has been is nominated by the Governor to replace Steve Moore, is the one that was representing the Commerce Commission in court in terms of all of these various rate increase defending the Commission. I question that person can adequately represent the consumer and plan to vote 'present' on this appropriation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition to this budget for slightly different reasons. We have within the office of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois a Consumer Rights Division which operates statewide and is operated quite successfully for many, many years under different administrations of the Attorney General's office, and when we are in a tight fiscal crunch, as we are now, even though reduction to zero would probably save less than \$600,000 of taxpayers' money, that is \$600,000 which would fund a lot of chewing gum and bailing wire grant agencies in this state, and I think we should take a look at this and other budgets in this year and we should...cut something, and this would be a good place to start. I urge a 'no' vote on this budget."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Well, yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of the Bill. The agency spent \$600,000 last year and reduced its appropriation this year to \$582,000, so they're making an effort to try to bring their expenditures in line along with the rest of the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

budget, but if we simply kill this Bill today, we can be assured it will spring up again in the Senate in Conference Committee or somewhere else, so my argument would be that we have a better control of this Bill to pass it today in a form that we can agree on and that is lower than last year than to simply kill it and believe that it's going to go away, because it simply is not. It will be back. It may very well be back for more, so let's just pass it as it is."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson to close."

- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the first two speakers addressing the Bill: number one, I believe I understand what he said. He has a personal opinion which he's entitled to. To the second speaker, I understand that there is similar work between the Attorney General's Office and the Public Counsel office. The workload is larger in...that one can handle in itself, and so they alternate back and forth on cases. I rise...or not rise but I appreciate the support of Representative Hannig, and I move for the passage of the Office of Public Counsel budget."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 638. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 84 'ayes', 10 'noes', 11 answering 'present', and House Bill 638, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 639, Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 639, this Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 639, a Bill for an Act making

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 639."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 639...House Bill 639
 appropriates \$1 for the ordinary and contingent Fiscal Year
 '92 expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. I move
 for adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 639. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 101 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 answering 'present', and HouseBill 639, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 640. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 640, this Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 640, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Abandoned Mine...Lands Reclamation Council. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 640."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates all federal funds in the amount of \$20,900,600 to the Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Council."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 640. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and House Bill 640, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Announcement from the Chair. The Thursday Adjournment will

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

be at 6:30. There was an error, it will be at 6:30 to allow the Governor to host the Appropriation Committee Chairman and vice—Chairman and Minority spokesman of the Appropriation Committee. Thursday Adjournment is at 6:30. Also the Minority vice—spokesman, too. You're all invited. All of them. I've been warned that's just for the Appropriations Committee; don't everybody troop over to the Governor's Mansion. It's Appropriations Committee only. The chairman and vice—chairman, Minority spokesman and vice—spokesman. House Bill 641, Clerk will read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 641. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 5 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Black on the Amendment #7."

 Black: "Yeah. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of; the House. I...think this Amendment addresses something that many of us in this chamber would like to have addressed, and that is what appears to be the sudden cessation of the civic center program; however, my appropriations people have said that...this is not the way to do that, and we'll have to withdraw Amendment #7."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Black on Amendment #8."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much. #8 is equally as good as #7, but unfortunately it must have the same fate. Please withdraw."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Withdraw Amendment #8. Further Amendments?" Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 841, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on...House Bill 641."
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, there's a...slight glitch here. Would you take it out of the record for the moment? I'll come back to it in just a minute. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 642, read the Bill"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill...This Bill's been read a second time previousl. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 642, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies and certain retirement systems. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Rice, are you seeking the attention of the Chair?"
- Rice: "Yes, I am, Sir. In the eight years I've been here I had one group. In the balcony from the Marcus Garvey...Elementary School. Give them a little..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "You're violating the law..."
- Rice: "May the Lord bless us."
- Speaker Matijevich: "You're violating the rules for the first time in eight ears."
- Rice: "May the Lord bless you and give you strength."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 642."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 642 appropriates \$26,940,700 for the Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the state employees, Judges and General Assembly Retirement Funds. Move for passage. Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 642. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 642, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 643. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 643. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were adopted in committee. No Motions. Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative

 Hanniq on Amendment #6."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This restores \$14,000 to the Water Pollution Division,
 which we inadvertently struck in Amendment #9. It was
 never our intention to do so..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative
 Hanniq and Bob Olson."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This restores \$413,249.

 Again it was inadvertently struck by Amendment #1, and I'd ask to have that money restored, and I'd move for the adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no', and Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 643, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 643."

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 643 appropriates \$456,677,700 plus those moneys that were just in the Agreed Amendments for the 1992 Fiscal Year ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. I move for passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 643. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Is this budget down from estimated expenditures for this year, and is head count down?"
- Olson, R.: "Much of this budget comes out of non GRF money. The head count is down. Excuse me, the head count is up, but is funded from non-GRF money."
- Dunn: "And how many new employees will there be in the EPA...next year compared to the number of employees on board in the year we are in now?"
- Olson, R: "Fiscal Year '92 will add 130 new positions."
- Dunn: "And what will be the source of funding for those positions?"
- Olson, R.: "I'm informed it's EPA federal money."
- Dunn: "What type of federal money? What are we doing here for 132..."
- Olson, R.: "I can't hear you, John."
- Dunn: "Well, 132 people, what are they going to do?"
- Olson, R.: "The bulk of these will work on the expansion of the Clean Air Act Amendment, I understand, and then in those areas which require vehicle inspections, underground storage tanks which we're familiar with, solid waste management. I think we've covered most of them there, John."
- Dunn: "What cost is there to the state for these people?"
- Olson, R.: "John, I couldn't hear you."
- Dunn: "Is there any cost to the State of Illinois for these

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

people?"

Olson, R.: "Well, let me explain it. The GRF funds are down from last year. One point seven million dollars, John. Did I answer your question?"

Dunn: "Well, I...if you can capture federal dollars and quite often when you do that, there is a related state expenditure. I just wonder if there is...a related state cost to capturing these federal dollars, in overhead or administration or a matching..."

Olson, R.: "I believe I heard your question. The capturing federal dollars that your talking about matches. I think our match is about equal to last year."

Dunn: "Matches are what?"

Olson, R.: "Our match with federal dollars is about equal to the dollars of last year."

Dunn: "Alright, is...there...some reason for that, or just because we did it last year? This is a tough year. Maybe the match should be down."

Olson, R.: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear John. Could you..."

Dunn: "Well, maybe we should let some federal dollars go is what..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let us have order here."

Dunn: "...I'm asking. If we have to match with state dollars, is there a good purpose to doing that, and if so, what is that purpose?"

Olson, R.: "I think you'd have to direct your questions to the EPA officials on that, Representative."

Dunn: "I can't hear him."

Matijevich: "Question is..."

Dunn: "I'll just let this Bill go."

Matijevich: "'...Shall House Bill 643 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

Schoenberg 'aye'. Jeff Schoenberg, 'aye'. Schoenberg.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Have all voted? Have all voted? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', 0 'nays' and House Bill 643, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 644. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 644. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment #4."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This truly is a technical change that corrects the wording. It was either a misspelling or a misconjugation..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment 5."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This does not change the bottom line, but it does transfer \$120,000 from administrative costs to the rehabilitation and minor construction in armories and camps, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 644, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Military Affairs. Third Reading of the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment...House Bill 644."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$11,260,000 of which \$10,126,200 is GRF for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Military Affairs."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved for the passage of House Bill 644. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Clerk will take...the...record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 644, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 645. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 645. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 645, a Bill for an Act making
- appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois State Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 645."

 Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 645 appropriates
 \$1,373,700 General Revenue Funds for the '92 ordinary and
 contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. This is a
 three and a half percent reduction from last year's
 estimated expenditure. Move for adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 645. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 645, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House 646. Read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 646. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on Floor Amendment #3."

 Hicks: "Thank you very much...Mr. Speaker. House Bill 649,

 Amendment #3 would reduce a...line item from \$8,000,000 to

 \$6,900,000. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks, you said 'House Bill 649, but are you on..."
- Hicks: "Excuse me. 646. Excuse me."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, then you're on the right Amendment.

 The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment.

 On that, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We stand in opposition to this for the following reasons. Although we do agree with the intent of the Sponsor of the Amendment to attempt some line items, I think that's an appropriate way to proceed, so we have greater detail. The problem is that he's taking \$1,100,000 out of the line items where the State Police provide services for local communities. Things like background checks, fingerprint checks, so that those local communities are now going to be shortchanged. By the time we get done with the budget, there's going to be a lot of folks that may not have all that they want. At this time we stand in opposition because we don't believe the manner in which this Amendment is taking place...is the best way to proceed."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks has moved for the adoption of Amendment...all in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 646, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of State Police. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 646."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates a total of \$193,607,100 of which \$125,248.90 is GRF."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 646. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 646, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 647. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 647. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 3 and 4 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Amendment #5 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 646."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This reallocates money from 4 programs that are in the grant line and calls for the hiring of 100 direct service employees for the Department of Children and Family Services with a net savings, reduction in the amount of appropriation of 1.5 million. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to

 Amendment #6 to House Bill 647. It would take away...it

 would eliminate all the community based service programs

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

that service our youth throughout the state. I think it's a bad Bill. The Bill...it has would affect programs in Cairo, Carbondale, Waukegan, Rockford, DuPage County and Rock Island, Danville and Chicago. That's statewide. So, I stand in opposition to the Bill because I feel that this is a bad Bill. It's taking money from the wrong areas."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder to close."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have to make priorities. One of the priorities I think we need to make is if you believe we need more direct care workers in the Department of Children and Family Services, this is your opportunity to do that. Of course, there's going to be some programs hurt. If you think that this budget, by the time it gets done, is going to keep everybody whole, then you certainly have an education coming in the next six weeks. We need to make some tough decisions. I happen to believe that we ought to be in favor of the kids, and this is one of the places where we can do it."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. 'Nos' have it, and the Amendment loses.

 It has lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative LeFlore."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore on Amendment 7."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #7 adds funds for a LeFlore: position in the Office οf Investigation which eliminates...which was eliminated by the Governor. acquired by reducing telecommunication lines and various divisions to fall within CMS quidelines. Contractual service dollars were reduced by \$175,000 because of the position being restored and added.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Contractual service funds are no longer necessary. The commodity lines is also reduced to fall within CMS guidelines. So, therefore, I move that Amendment #7 be adopted."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative LeFlore has moved for adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 647, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 647."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates funds for the Department of Children and Family Services' ordinary and contingent expenses. I move for the passage of this Bill."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 647. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 answering 'present'. House Bill 647, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 649. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 649. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions, No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 649, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 649."
Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 649 does appropriate \$13,749,500 from the bank and trust fund for the Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust. I wish to re-emphasize, there are no General Revenue Funds in this budget, and it's just a personal...or not a personal but a note I'd like to pass on. In committee, we did reduce \$51,000 from their own fund, so to speak, eliminating COLA increases. We felt that other agencies are going to be living within an austerity budget, that even though there's no General Revenue Funds involved here, we also held their COLA increases out on them. I move for adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 649. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there are 110 'ayes', 1 'no', and House Bill 649, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 650. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 650. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 650, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Civil Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 650."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 650 appropriates

General Revenue Funds in the amount of \$437...\$437,700 for

Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the

Civil Service Commission. I simply move for the passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Bill 651. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are lll 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 650, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 651. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 651. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman on Amendment #3."
- Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. By keeping the Peoria office open for the Industrial Commission, there's only one employee there, and when we did not get the 30 employees that...were needed last year, this adds six additional employees, and it kind of tailgates with myself and Representative Mautino did earlier on 505."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that, Representative Olson."
- Olson R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Representative's Amendment. This \$36,000 General Revenue Fund is to restore six vacancies which have...if I recall have been vacant for over ten months. The...in light of the elimination of jobs in many agencies across the whole appropriation process, I rise in opposition to this Amendment, and I ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 77 'ayes', 34 'nays', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 651, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 651."

- the Industrial Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 651 appropriates \$11,618,400 of General Revenue Funds for the '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Commission. I might point out that with the \$36,000 just added by Amendment, we are still substantially below the current fiscal year's estimated total expenditure. I move for adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 651. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn. Alright, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 651 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', and House Bill 651, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 652. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 652. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 652, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on House Bill 652."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 652 appropriates \$8,168,500 of which \$7,968,500 are General Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year '92 ordinary and contingent

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

expenditures of the Court of Claims. This is a reduction
in General Revenue Funds of 3.4 percent. I move for

passage."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 652 pass?'

 All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are lll 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 652, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 653. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 653, a Bill for an Act making appropriations, Department of Farm Development Authority.

 No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 653, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Farm Development Authority.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 653."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This reappropriates \$21,417,600...to the Illinois Farm Development Authority.

 This reappropriation is the same as it's been for the last two years."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 653 pass?'

 Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 110 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 answering 'present', House Bill 653, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 654. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 654. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 654, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 654."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$948,100 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prisoner Review Board, all of which is GRF, and I move adoption of this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 654 pass?'

 Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

 Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. House Bill 654, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 655. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 655. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment 1."
- Ryder: "Thank you. This...reduces...GRF, personal services line and adds it into the telecommunication line."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

 'Ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 655, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Third Reading

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 655."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As amended, this appropriates funds for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. I move its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 655. On that the Gentleman from Macon, Representative
 Dunn."
- Dunn: "Would you explain the Amendment again which...shifts money from someplace to telecommunications and then tell me whether this agency will have more money to spend this year than last year."
- Ryder: "Certainly, Representative, I'd be glad to do that. It reduces \$104,700 GRF in the personal services line, and adds that exact amount to the telecommunication line. This is at the request of the department. We had originally made a cut of that amount, but...they simply reallocated it within the budget, so it's the same bottom line as coming out of the committee, and it is less than introduced and less than last year's expenditure."
- Dunn: "Why should this agency, which is strapped for money in the first place...take money from personal services and put it into telecommunications?"
- Ryder: "Representative, one of the ways that this agency is saving money is by effective use of our conference system, which allows them to speak with the folks in Chicago. They feel by utilizing that they'll be able to effectively and efficiently do their job, but, yet, will not require as many people. This agency, by the way, has been fairly static in the number of people that it employs. However, there is a cost for that conference facility, and that's why the telecommunication line is increased."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Dunn: "Will there be a reduction in personnel in this agency?

 Will the head count go down?"
- Ryder: "Representative, the current status is that it's reduced...the current status is reduced from the beginning of the year. So, if you're saying, 'Will there be a reduced personnel on...in the commission as of July 1st, from June 30th, no. As of July 1st of 1991...July 1st of 1990, the answer is 'yes'."
- Dunn: "You lose me on the fiscal year. And...what about...grant money available to pay for services in the local court system? What happens with regard to that? Up or down?"
- Ryder: "Representative, the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission does not make those grants."
- Dunn: "Is that Guardianship Referral that makes them? I'm confused."
- Ryder: "The part that you're talking about hasn't been funded by us in several years; therefore they don't make grants.

 They do pay for the services that are rendered."
- Dunn: "Well, there has been a nagging...in at least the downstate court systems for several years about a lack of funds from the State of Illinois, and I thought they came from this agency...historically."
- Ryder: "Representative, the criticism that you lodge is a valid one. We probably agree with that. This budget, however, does not address the problem that you indicate."
- Dunn: "So this...this budget has a very serious...Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill...in this budget has a very serious hole in it, and it's a human service hole. This agency, while I'm not probably as well versed in its activities as I ought to be, provides guardianship services and advocacy services for those who are in need of them and who cannot otherwise afford them. It also historically has...has provided

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

payments to our local county court systems...when those services were provided locally by the courts and reimbursement was then provided by the state. The state mandates these services. The local courts don't have any money to pay for them, and if we cut this budget further, people in need are going to be in more serious need than they are now, and they are desperate now. So, I think we ought to rework this budget...and meet our responsibility which is not being met at the current level of funding."

Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 655 pass?'

Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 106 'ayes', 1 'nay', 3 answering 'present'. House Bill 655, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill 656. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 656, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1, was adopted in committee.

There's a Motion to table Amendment #1, by Representative Hicks."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on a Motion to table Amendment #1."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to table
Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would you tell what the Committee Amendment did, or do you know? Or is that agreed to, if it's agreed to we don't have to worry about it. Looks like it's agreed too. Representative Hicks moves to table Amendment #1.

All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment...Committee Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 656, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of State Fire Marshall. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 656."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates \$9,779,000 of other funds to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fire Marshall. There was a reduction that was made in committee, but that reduction has not been tabled so the Bill is as introduced."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 656 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 0 'nays'. House Bill 656, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 657. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 657. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 657, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 657."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$263,600 of which \$107,000 is General Revenue Funds for the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 657 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

On this question, there are 105 'ayes', 0 'nays', 2 answering 'present'. House Bill 657, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 658. The Clerk will read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 658. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Stern."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Grace Mary Stern on Amendment #5."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #5 would delete 3.3 million from this budget, which is earmarked for use in the renovation of St. Anne's. This is a relatively long story, which I will try to give you in one sentence. When Illinois State Psychiatric Institute turned up with a asbestos that had to be removed, the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities had options: either to move the patients out and do the renovation and then move them back or try to do it with the patients in-house. They chose to do the first, and...the plan at that time, and the figure at that time, was that it would cost about \$800,000 and be ready in 1989. We are still way behind schedule on this. We have already sunk over \$6,000,000 into the project, the patients are still at ISPI have not even moved to St. Anne's. We feel that it is to...stop and look at this, re-examine it, see if perhaps we have...time still to cut our losses and try a different solution. We think this is a very serious problem, and we ask your support in deleting these funds from the Mental Health Fund. In addition we have some concern whether moneys from this fund can be used for capital development, instead of for services. Thank you." Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stern has moved for the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

adoption of Amendment #5 and on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support...the...presenter of the Amendment to the St. Anne's ISPI Project. The project is running something like two years behind, to date, as it also stated, has been spent. We could have purchased St. Anne's Hospital for \$3,000,000, so I think that we are really going beyond board in trying to establish this complex. Department of Mental Health has had enough time, they're coming back asking us for an additional \$3.3 million dollars. That's ridiculous, so I stand in support of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the Amendment, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While there may be some problems as evidenced by the existence of this Amendment, let me suggest to you that what it is that you are going to do if you support this Amendment. You're going to suggest the residents of the Illinois, of ISPY, those people who are...have mental illness have to stay in a ll-story building, in which the stairwells are collapsing. going to have to stay in an 11-story building in which the walls are cracked. We have significant building code violations, life safety code violations; the cooling system has to be replaced. What you're suggesting is that these people have to stay here, while you and I decide whether a project, which was started two years ago, is a good idea. They have to stay in a building that is unsafe. There may be some problems, I don't disagree with that, but the manner in which to deal with that is to proceed with the project, to vote against this Amendment, and then let's work together, rather in a last minute effort, let's work together to see if there are...the funds we are using are

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

being used in the best way. I ask that you defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McGann on the Amendment."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. In due McGann: respect to the previous speaker, relative to the problems at ISPY, which have been going on for over two years, which the original estimate was only going to be \$800,000 to renovate St. Anne's Hospital and when asked about the purchase of St. Anne's Hospital, we were told that it was not able to be purchased. We then found out that it was sold, sold to another party that is charging exorbitant rent, and the renovation started was not completed. We now find in St. Anne's Hospital they was an asbestos problem that we don't even know how many dollars are going to be provided to help in that area. We have spent, pretty close to \$8,000,000 to date. What we're asking here Amendment #5 is to hold off this 3.3 million. It will have no effect on anything on those patients that are at ISPY right now and for the months to come because this is an appropriation for 1992, which would come into effect July 1. If this whole problem, this very, very serious problem, is straightened out by the time this goes over to the Senate, it can be handled there, but right now we have a very, very serious problem which is brought about from poor decision making for the last two years, and this is our real problem. Forget the stairwells, forget everything else. Those patients are being taken care of, and we know, at least at a meeting last week, the department stated that they're planning on moving into St. Anne's on June 14, but now as of yesterday, we found out they can't move in on June 14 of 1991, because of the fact they're having an asbestos problem. Let's not add more millions to the problem we already have. I'd ask you to support Amendment

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

#5."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern to close."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members, of the House. I just want to emphasize the meter is running even as we speak. We are paying \$100,000 rent for a building we do not own, which we are pouring money into, and I think we have to stop and look at this. I think it's extremely serious. This morning, I understand, the workers walked off the job because of the presence of asbestos. This does not seem to me a way to get on with the task. I ask your support of this Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stern has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment #6."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is to eliminate money that was added over and above the budget, in committee. It is an add—on of some \$16,865,000 that we wish to reduce. Not saying that it isn't for a good purpose. It is, but frankly, we can't afford the budget as now stands and I would ask for you to help balance the budget by voting for this Amendment, which would take back those funds."
- Speaker, Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor, say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. The Clerk will read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 658, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder, on House Bill 658."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$909,000,000 for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. I would move for adoption of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 658 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting...I'm sorry, Representative Novak, I didn't see you."

Novak: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Novak: "Representative Ryder. Does this budget contain all the layoffs for state employees in all the facilities around the state?"

Ryder: "This budget is now in the status as introduced by the Governor, except for..."

Novak: "Could you tell the General Assembly how many employees are being laid off in the Department of Mental Health?"

Ryder: "Approximately 300."

Novak: "Approximately what, Sir?"

Ryder: "Three hundred."

Novak: "How many direct patient care employees are being laid off that are going to affect the delivery of services?"

Ryder: "It is my understanding, I can't tell you exactly because there's bumping rights and other items that are a part of the union contract and so, I can't tell you exactly, but the majority almost unanimous was in non-direct care staffing."

Novak: "Well, from what I understand, our staff has been quite persistent in trying to get information from the department

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

to who's being laid off and they have been with respect unsuccessful. it kind of disturbs and me, Representative ο£ the largest mental health district...largest mental health facility in the State of Illinois, in Kankakee, as well as many other facilities, that we can't get information from the department on being laid off. We're being asked to support a Bill, to support an agency budget Bill, when we don't even have any information on what that budget's going to be for that particular facility."

Ryder: "Is there a question in there?"

Novak: "Well, a statement and a question. I..."

Ryder: "I'll be glad to answer the question. I just didn't hear the question, Representative."

Novak: "Representative Ryder, do you have a mental health facility in your district?"

Ryder: "You betcha, I do."

Novak: "Do you know how many people are being laid off in your facility?"

Ryder: "No, Sir, I do not, exactly. Approx...No, I don't."

Novak: "Well..."

Ryder: "To the Representative, let me say this. Let me say this, in response to the valid concern that you have raised."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder, we're going to dump this Roll Call and go back to the..."

Ryder: "No. No."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, you're going to have a hard time passing the Bill then, so we want to reconsider the vote on the Second Amendment."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, if you please, I'm attempting to accommodate a Representative for whom I have respect, and the questions that he's answering, he asked questions during explanation of both, but because I wish to accommodate him, I'm glad to

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

 answer the questions as best I wish, but the Roll Call was
 taken."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, the Roll Call hasn't been taken yet.

 Representative Ryder can you come up here for a moment.

 Just for a moment. Is this a private conference, Mr.

 Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yep. Yep."

Ryder: "Always glad to accommodate."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk will dump the Roll Call.

 Representative Black, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Black: "An inquiry of the Chair? Sometimes, we have equipment malfunctions and it's necessary to dump the Roll Call. I'm not aware that the equipment malfunctioned, by what rule of the House, are you dumping that Roll Call?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, we didn't get some signals straight, so we're...otherwise we're just going to delay everything.

 We wouldn't...put the votes on we were going to take some votes on...This...we're going to accommodate this."
- Black: "Well, I...under Rule (6), the...on Roll Call votes, I don't think that there's anything in here about signals being crossed as a reason to dump the Roll Call. If...something was wrong with the equipment or there is a serious...malfuntion of the equipment that's one thing, but just to have the...Chair make what appears to be an arbitrary ruling that the Roll Call would be dumped. opens...you up to all kinds of...requests to dump Roll Calls."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Black...The Gentleman asks leave to move the Bill back to Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? The Bill's...leave. Using the Attendance Roll Call, the Bill's on Second Reading. Okay, Representative Ryder, did you want to yell and scream a little bit?"
- Ryder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I could. If I could have the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

attention of the House. Let me explain, to you, what's going on here. Alright? We just voted on Second Reading on an Amendment that took away \$16,000,000 of add-ons. Those were added on in committee, over our objections, not because we didn't want them, but because we can't afford we added an Amendment to this Bill that took away those \$16,000,000 of add-ons, and the Representative that raised the question, it didn't add one person to any state facility, it didn't add back one of the 300 jobs that...for which we have a legitimate reason to complain, but because we all did that, when it went to Third Reading, then the Chair decided that you had to change the script. So, now you see the Bill. It's on Second Reading. It's on Second Reading because the Chair is abusing his discretion and not taking the Roll Call when it was taken. this Bill heard; we want this Bill passed today, but let it recorded, if you will, the cooperation we're offering and the abuse that we just received, Mr. Chair."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you, Representative Ryder. I think you make a good point. Representative LeFlore now moves to table Amendment #6. Representative LeFlore. The Gentleman from Cook."
- LeFlore: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table
 Amendment #6...which will cut \$16,865,9.000 out of the
 budget...I think the Members should look at this very close
 and...considering and checking this Amendment off...to
 House Bill 5...to 658."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #6 and on that, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, I don't intend to belabor this issue. If I could have your attention, please. I don't intend to belabor this issue, but for those of you who have mental health facilities in your

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

district, for those of you who have to go back to your district and face those people that are getting laid off, let me be very clear, that if you vote in favor of this Amendment or to table this Amendment, you're saying that those jobs are not as important to you as \$16,000,000 worth of grants someplace else. So don't make any mistake. Understand that you're adding on to the budget, and that your vote should be recorded accordingly. For that reason, we obviously oppose the tabling of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on the tabling Motion." "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Hicks: the House. You know it's amazing to me that...here we hear all the rhetoric concerning this Amendment and about...what was done or was not done in committee. Let me tell you the facts and the facts are many, many times our staff, agency after agency requested information that we needed to be able to make serious judgments about finances in the State of Illinois, time and time again we've not received the information we requested. When we want to know about cuts in agencies, when we want to know about cuts in jobs, we don't find it. The information isn't given to us, so when you sit over there and you talk about these cuts and what we ought to be aware of, we'd like to be aware of what these are, but it is not provided to us."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman on the tabling Motion."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I agree with the previous speaker, and if some of them people over there that think that this agency is run right they ought to come to Peoria and see the most mismanaged facility in the State of Illinois. I don't see how anybody could even vote for this total budget, for nothing, until somebody puts this agency together. We've had tons of problems there. They

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

haven't been straightened out, and the Department of Mental Health don't seem like they want to, either. So I have to agree with Representative Hicks."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative LeFlore has moved for the tabling of a Motion. Motion #...tabling of Amendment #6.

Those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 658, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're back on track. Representative Ryder, thank you for your cooperation."

Rvder: "Well, I'm not so sure that we're back on track. certainly we're on Third Reading on this Bill. The Bill is introduced as Department of Mental Health and а Developmental Disabilities. We had some agreed cuts that in committee. We took out \$3,000,000 came out Representative Stern's Amendment concerning ISPI. Ιn committee, there was added on \$16.5 million. We attempted, by this Amendment #6, to remove that add-on. We were not successful. As a result I now ask for a passage of the Bill as amended. I hope that explanation satisfies. If it doesn't, I'll be glad to do my best to answer questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder has moved for the passage of House Bill 658. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 85 'ayes', 9 'nays', and House Bill

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- 658, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 659. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 659. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments #3 and 4 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative McGann, for what purpose do you rise?"
- McGann: "Yes. On the last Bill, Department of Mental Health there, I want to be recorded as 'aye'. I tried to get my switch: it wouldn't go on."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The record will reflect Representative McGann is voting 'aye', and Wyvetter Younge, also.

 Alright. The Gentleman has moved for the...No, Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 659, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 659."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have no Amendments on this Bill, so I think we'll be able to progress with it. This...appropriates for the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse a total of \$151,853,000 of which \$76,189.00 is General Revenue Funds. I move for the adoption. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 659. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 659 pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', 3 'nays'. House Bill 659, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr.

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Clerk...we're going to go back to three Bills that were taken out of the record. House Bill 637. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 637. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 8 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Hicks and Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on Amendment #9. I understand, Representative...Are you ready, Representative Hicks? If not, Representative Ryder, is waiting on board."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #9 corrects a technical error in Amendment #2, by changing \$2,267,700 and inserting in lieu thereof \$2,900,6...\$2,967,700."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved..."
- Hicks: "In the Wildlife and Fish Fund."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We agree with this Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. All in favor of the Amendment #9 say 'aye', opposed, 'nay', and Amendment #9 is adopted.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment #10."
- Ryder: "Thank you. This makes a language change...which is technical concerning a reappropriation for the Department of Conservation."
- Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of Amendment number...Representative Ryder has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay', and Amendment #10 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Hicks."

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Amendment #11 reduces in contractual services \$1,200,000 to zero."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11. On that, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you. Inquiry of the Chair. Has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Has the Amendment been printed and distributed?"
- Ryder: "Just in case you're interested, we don't have it over here."
- Speaker Matijevich: "I haven't got an answer yet. I'm as anxious as you are. Evidently the Gentleman in charge isn't there for them to ask...it has not, I understand...it has not been distributed, I understand, so this Amendment is out of the record. Further Amendments? Representative...Ryder moves to table the Amendment...since it has not been distributed. Leave to table Amendment #11.

 Leave...Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 637, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 637."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$181,402...for the Department of Conservation."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House
 Bill 637 and on that, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Here's another example of trying to get information on Bills. I would ask that all Democrat

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Members please vote 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I can understand the concern of the Chairman, in the request that he just made, I would also suggest to you that those of you that support the Department of Conservation, those of you that are part of that that have the hunters, the fisherman and the folks that use the parks and enjoy the wildlife should consider rather strongly your position on this Bill. There are some questions to be answered, I acknowledge that, let's keep the Bill moving in the process. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 637 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take...let's give 'em a few more to put on Postponed anyway. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk take the record. On this question there are 48 'ayes', 1 'nay', and Representative Ryder asks leave to put the Bill on...on alright, and the Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional...alright, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns that are expressed and I appreciate the courtesy to being able to speak to this issue. I understand what's being expressed over there, but if you're going to hold this budget hostage and that's what those 'present' votes are talking about, then we've got a lot more problems than this. If this is the way that you're going to deal with the budget problems, of the state, if this is the way you wish to accomplish it, then we're going to have a lot more problems than this. That's fine. I'd like to keep that Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the record. Representative Olson, for what purpose do you rise?"

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Olson: "I wish to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Okay. Olson, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 49 'ayes', l 'nay', and 61 voting 'present', and House Bill 637, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Return to House Bill 631. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 631. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Motions? The Clerk will read the Bill.

No, we're waiting for an Amendment. Representative Olson,

are you seeking...recognition?"

Olson: "Have you called the Bill?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We called the Bill, but we're waiting for...Amendments on Second Reading."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Ryder: "We wish to take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the Bill out of the record. Is the Parliamentarian within voice or listening? Mike Pollack around? The House will be back. We're back in session now. We're on House Bill 631. Representative Olson, I understand we're back with the Bill in record. Where's Representative Olson? Representative Olson? Bob Olson? Oh...Representative Olson, am I correct, that we...now want the Bill back in the record? Is that alright?"

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wait until I find my file."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Clerk will...the Amendment's on House Bill 631."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's been read a second time previously.

Amendments #1 and #2 have been adopted. No further

Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 631, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Lottery. Third Reading of the Bill."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today, House Bill 631 was on Third. It appropriates \$432,600...\$432,622,300 for the '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of the Lottery. We had considerable discussion, questions were asked, questions were answered. I think Representative Dunn had a question which we had to get information for. Is Representative Dunn present?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's not here. Oh, here he is."

- Olson: "Representative Dunn, on the Lottery Bill, you had a question relative to advertising. The advertising budget in this appropriation Bill, is down \$645,000. I believe that, Mr. Speaker, should take care of all the questions that we had earlier, and I'd move for the passage of this Appropriation Bill for the lottery."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 631 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...Schoenberg, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 'ayes', 0 'nays'. House Bill 631, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now return to House Bill 641. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 641. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 641, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for reappropriations to various agencies.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 641."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates \$663,835,000 as introduced, however, as it came out of cCommittee, it's \$604,548,000 of which only \$80,000,000 is GRF. I move adoption of and passage of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder moves for the passage of House Bill 641. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the Bills as it now stands on Third Reading, what is the head count for this agency compared to the head count for the fiscal year that we're in, estimated at the end of the year?"

Ryder: "Representative, the head count will be down, reduced by some 80 people, 80 people."

Dunn: "And what is the total head count, for this agency, after it has been reduced by 80 people?"

Ryder: "705."

Dunn: "705?"

Ryder: "Yes."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr....Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 641

pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 'ayes', 7 'nays', 6 answering 'present'. House Bill 641, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Morrow voting 'aye'. Jan Schakowsky voting 'aye'. Morrow, 'aye'.

Let the record reflect their votes. House Bill 660. The Clerk will read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 660, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Office of Commissioners and Savings in Residential Finance.

This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments. Third Reading."

Speaker Matijevich: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 660, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Residential Finance.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson on the Bill."

- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 660 appropriates \$2,772,200 from the Savings and Residential Finance Regulatory Fund for the '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Savings and Residential Finance. Fellow Members, there are no General Revenue Funds in here. The other funds are cut by 14, almost 15%. I move for passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the passage of House Bill 660. The question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', 0 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. House Bill 660, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 736. Who's handling that Speaker Bill? The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 736. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee. A Motion to table Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

We worked very hard in committee to try to find as many cuts as possible throughout the agencies that came before our committee. On the Attorney General's budget, though however, I think we've probably went a little bit too far, and House Amendment #1, which we put on in committee eliminated 17 new positions along with the merit compensation, out of respect for the Attorney General who is a duly elected officer in his own right, and who has requested these positions. I now move at this time that we table Amendment #1 and restore those positions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig has moved to table

Amendment #1 and on that Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment makes certain cuts in positions and in merit compensation. It also, I believe, had some abestments...asbestments...asbestos, excuse me, I'm wrong there, but I would move to table the Gentleman's Motion. Excuse me, I object to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on the tabling Motion."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what's gone on in the past two weeks. This was an Agreed Amendment in the committee. Republicans and Democrats agreed to make these cuts in the Attorney General. I don't know what's happened, but I think that when you cast this vote, you're suggesting that somehow the Attorney General is immune from any cuts, that's okay to lay off folks back home, but it's not okay to do the same principle for the Attorney General. If you want to vote on party lines that's fine, but I think this is so important that we ought to have a Roll Call, and I request so."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Weaver on the tabling

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Motion."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in...opposition to the Motion. Besides being an Agreed Amendment during committee, we are going to have some really tough explanations back home to make, when...when the folks back discover that everything else is getting cut and the Attorney General's budget is adding 39 new positions. the same time we remove people from Corrections, people from Mental Health and people from doggone near every other agency in state government. We have a fiscal problem, folks, and we've got to start addressing it, and we can't do it by allowing a departmental budget like this to out of committee at a higher level than it went in. This budget includes a \$500,000 for a new computer system for first year cost and down the road it's going to end up costing us \$3 and \$4,000,000. We can't afford this budget, and I think the Attorney General ought to start setting a better example for us."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Representative Hannig moves to table the Amendment. All those in favor, all those in favor of the tabling Motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hannig to explain his vote."

Hannig: "Well, yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since I didn't have a chance to close, I just say that the Attorney General will have to run on this budget when he seeks reelection four years from now. Point #2 is we're offering this same courtesy to the Governor's office and to the Secretary of State, so we're not trying to be partisan, so this budget will come out at the same level that it was introduced. It will not be added on, but we will table this Amendment and I thank you for your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'ayes', 43 'nays', and the...Motion carries, and the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Bob Olson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson on Amendment #4."

Olson: "Thank, you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 to House Bill 736 does several things. It eliminates merit compensation and new positions. This will be a reduction of \$1,929,000 39 Funds. Ιt of General Revenue eliminates certain contractual services and equipment. This reduction will amount to \$512,000. It eliminates the funding for the enhancement of information services, a reduction of half a million dollars. Total reduction of this Amendment is just a little less than \$3,000,000 in General Revenue Funds. would like to say a couple things. Merit compensation eliminates merit compensation. I think almost every agency is eliminating merit compensation with the exception of one we had earlier here today which had questions, the Supreme By legislative mandate, they get their 5% or less, Court. whatever might be merit comp. No other agency is getting Thirty nine new positions. Mr. Speaker, could I have some quiet?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Give the Gentleman...his attention here, your attention."

Olson: "Thank you. No other agency is earning merit compensation with 39 new positions, 39 new positions. Let me tell you, I think it's 1,400 positions that are being eliminated in our budget this year, at this hour, at least. Those 1,400 all have mortgages, children, responsibilities to their home, they need their job. We're creating 39 new positions and let me tell you what this is going to cost. We're talking about a 40% increase over last year for incoming

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

attorneys, Assistant Attorney Generals, if you will. I...can't understand and I'm trying to be bi-partisan here, Ladies and Gentlemen, and that comes from my heart, but I can't understand how we can eliminate positions, give no one else increases in pay and for the Attorney General spend \$3,000,000 for increasing positions and pay in his office. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative.."

Olson: "I'd like a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 and on that, the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. again I must stand in opposition to this proposal. Part of what the...Gentleman is trying to do was simply undo the Motion that we just tabled and also to have us vote on part of Bill...or part of an Amendment that was defeated in committee. Again, we have a Constitutionally elected officer here, and if you think it's a bad way of running the office, that's fine, in four years you can make that an issue in the Attorney General's race. Roland Burris will have to account for his position in spending, but we offer this courtesy to the Attorney General, to the Secretary of State, to the Comptroller, to the Treasurer, regardless of their Party, and I don't think that we should make it a partisan issue here and let's also be honest about one thing, when these budgets were approved last year, for the Attorney General's office, I...have to confess that I think it was approved at a realistically low level. We had a Gentleman running for Governor, and he wanted to have a fine budget and he did, but now we've got to get back to the reality. We've got an Attorney General now for four years that's got to do the job and he needs this budget,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

and I would ask the Members on this side and that side, to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There was some wisdom in what the previous speaker said. As I recall we were supposed to cut 2% out of all those budgets. We should have started with the Attorney General and that's what we're attempting to do now, and, absolutely, the Attorney General does have to run on this budget, but he's running on this budget in four years. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, each of us is going to run on this budget next year, and if you want to say that it's more important to you to have additional employees in the Attorney General's office than it is to have employees taking care of the mental health people of our state; it's more important to you to have employees in the Attorney General's office than it is to have guards prisons or to have people receiving public aid benefits, then when we ask for a Roll Call, and we have, let your vote be counted."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let's not forget what our jobs are. Sure, we want to accord the courtesies to elected Constitutional officers, but the ultimate responsibility for the allocation of scarce state resources lies right here in this chamber. It is our responsibility to allocate the limited funds that the taxpayers send over here, and if the Constitutional officers aren't responsible enough to do it, we need to help them. You need to vote green on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Olson to close."

Olson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. 5% merit increase. I looked up in the gallery earlier today; a lobbyist or liaison, whichever word you choose was up there from AFSCME. I hope

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

they're in earshot of this right now. AFSCME, they have pickets out at Mental Health and Corrections facilities in the last week or so. Ι hope they're listening today. Parole officers, parole officers, why is it so important that we put on 39 more Assistant Attorneys General and lay off, I believe it's 127 parole agents, from the Department of Corrections? Balance that out for me. The tabling of the Amendment...it was passed in committee as we started this discussion. That eliminated money that we added in committee for asbestos abatement, the result of that particular tabling is bringing a Bill out of the House at a higher level than it was introduced at. That's not dood government, and I've got to come back to one more thing that one of the previous speakers said, the Attorney General will be judged in four years when he runs for re-election. We will be judged in two years or less when we run for re-election, and I would like to have this kind of increase just come falling in to my campaign fund or into my district office allotment. Ladies and even Gentleman, as bi-partisan as I can be, this is not a good Amendment. I urge you to vote your conscience and give us some 'no' votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you sure it's your Amendment? You sure
 you want that?"

Olson: "Mr. Speaker, I correct myself."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're going to give you what you want."

Olson: "John, you've looked over my shoulder and helped me since
the day I got down here, and I thank you again, but I'd
like a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no', and give him what he wants. Have all voted? Have

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 46 'ayes', 57 'nays', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 736, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Attorney General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This would increase the General Revenue Fund for the Attorney General for \$27,290,000 to \$32,024,000. It would increase non-GRF funding from \$2,821,000 to \$4,554,000. This is the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, Ladies and Gentleman, the individual that we often call when we have complaints, consumer complaints, the person that we talk to when we need help in legal interpretations, someone who probably does much or more for anyone in the State of Illinois...than I can think of and so, I would ask you at this time to join with me and let's pass this Bill over to the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 736 and on that Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to be brief: Just understand that this Bill now contains the Amendments that we placed on it, so that not only do you have a Roll Call on the Amendment, but you also have a Roll Call on this. You're saying that the Attorney General should come before the other people of the State of Illinois. That's a green vote. If you think the other people should come first, that's a red vote. I think that's as plain as I can state it."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- "The question is, 'Shall Speaker Matijevich: House Bill 736 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 42 'nays', 6 answering 'present'. House Bill 736, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Saltsman? Representative Saltsman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Saltsman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have filed a Motion to have a vote reconsidered. Has the Motion been set...been returned?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman has filed a Motion with the Clerk to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 637 was failed and the Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading and held there. Does he have leave by the Attendance Roll Call on that? Leave, and House Bill 637 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading and held there. The Chair would like to apologize to Representative Hultgren. I had my Calendar over your light, and I understand you've been seeking recognition. I apologize for that. House Bill 737. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 737. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and #2 were adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Amendment #3 was withdrawn, in committee. Amendment #4, offered by Representative Bob Olson."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson, on Amendment #4."
- Olson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 to House Bill 737 eliminates \$942,000 for a grant to continue the development of a commercial drivers' center at Triton Junior College.

 I would like to explain this Motion a little bit. This Motion came up in committee and was defeated. The Senator

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

who wants this \$942,000 appropriated for this drivers center at Triton College reappeared in our Committee Room, a Motion was made to reconsider and then the Amendment and the spending passed. My reason for bringing this back Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have attention, I don't believe that there's anyone, on either side of the aisle, who has got a million dollars worth of pork in the appropriation process at this hour, nor do you anticipate getting a million dollars worth of pork when this General Assembly winds up in mid-summer. I have no problem with the Senator seeking this \$942,000, but by the end of this week this Bill, with or without, is going to be in the Senate, and he will have ample opportunity to amend this Bill in his own chamber. I don't see any reason for us to be considering here today on this Appropriation Bill or any other House Appropriation Bill considered here why we should be considering an Amendment for the benefit of someone in the other chamber. Again, look at your own record to this date and what you anticipate between now and the end of the week and now and the end of the Session and how much do you think that you're going to get to take home? I urge a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, the Gentleman...Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I also want a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Sure, that you'll get...on that, the

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Obrzut."

Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand and oppose to this
Amendment. It's a very important project for my district.

It affects Triton College. It's not just a favor to the
Senator; it's also very important to the Representative in
this...in the 52nd District, and I would hope that all the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Democrats vote 'no' on this Amendment. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Stange."
- Stange: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also oppose Amendment #4.

 This Amendment #4 basically talks about commercial driving schools. Today we want our highways safe. This is one way to do it. It's not only going to benefit the 44th District or the 52nd District, it's going to benefit the people of the State of Illinois, and I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would just say that when we had the Secretary of State into committee and just flat out asked him his position on the Amendment, he said it was fine, that he would accept it. We talked about trying to give these Constitutional officers reasonable opportunity to put a budget on the Governor's desk that they could live with, and here's a chance to give the Secretary of State something that he has...apparently has no problem with, so I would ask Members from this side of the aisle to give the same courtesy to George Ryan as we just did to the Attorney General of this State, Roland Burris. I'd ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a rather unique Amendment that is being presented, which will eliminate a facility that is used to assist commercial drivers in developing a drug and alcohol screening and counseling facility, to train and rehabilitate commercial drivers pursuant to the 1988

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Illinois Commercial Drivers Safety and Fitness Study. This is all a part of the Federal Highway Safety Act, which was eluded to Representative Stange. Let me enlighten some you on why this is necessary. Does anybody in this room know what a BAC level is for a commercial driver? don't, let me tell you it's .04, that's across the nation. What this establishes with the Amendment that was included in the Bill is a continuation of what we're supposed to be doing as it pertains to commercial drivers, commercial licenses and the rehabilitation and counseling for those individuals who need it. Those individuals who need it should not...those who have a problem should not be on the road. Those that are working to correct their problem, it under this provision. I recommend, as well as the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Gary Hannig, that opposition be presented to this Amendment. It should be included in the appropriation in 1992, as it was in 1991 and in 1990."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Also, as a member of that...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Member of that Appropriations Committee, I was there that evening, and I did the same thing that we did just a while ago about voting on prevailing side. We brought this Amendment back because the Secretary of State was not opposed to it. He did not say he wanted it, but was not opposed to it and is not for it. This money is coming out of the road fund, and it's money that had been there before and...for that reason, I think everybody here should vote 'no' on that Amendment. The Secretary of State is not for this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Williams: "...yield. I just want to question. Is this new money that's being added or that you're trying to take out or is this...or is this just for the continued operation of an existing facility?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Representative Williams, the best way I can answer that question is that it's money that comes from the road fund.

It's been appropriated in the past, yes, but it was not in the initial request through the appropriation process this year, so it's old money, but it's new. We're bringing it back today, so to speak."

Speaker Matijevich: "You say it's out of the road fund?"

Olson: "Out of the road fund."

Williams: "Okay, so this money would not be generally available?"

Olson: "It's not General Revenue Fund."

Williams: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 36 'ayes', 67 'nays', and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 737, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson on House Bill 737."

Olson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 737 appropriates \$269,055,000 for the '92 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Secretary of State. These funds come from General Revenue Funds, roughly \$96,000,000 other funds, \$126,000,000 federal funds, \$6,000,000. I move for

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- passage."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for passage of House Bill 737 and on that the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say that we, on this side of the aisle, extend our support to the Secretary of State on his appropriation, and we want to help him get something that he can work with and so I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 737

 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by

 voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all

 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

 question there are 111 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 1 answering

 'present'. House Bill 737, having received a

 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House

 Bill 766. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 766. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 766, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the East St. Louis Financial Advisory Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on House Bill 766."
- Ryder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$350,000 to GRF for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the East St. Louis Financial Advisory Authority."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 766 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 102 'ayes', 4 'nays' and House Bill 766, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- declared passed. House Bill 808, Representative Hicks. House Bill 808, Representative Hannig, can you handle that? The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 808. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions filed. Amendment #2 was withdrawn and Amendment #3 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Is that one being withdrawn? Alright, is

 Representative Hicks here now? Amendment #4, is that

 withdrawn, Representative Hicks? Further Amendments? #4

 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on Amendment #5.

 Amendment #..."
- Hicks: "Mr. Speaker will you take the Bill out of the record and then we'll come back."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 886, Representative McGann. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 886. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ropp."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Ropp on Amendment #2."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As you all remember, a couple of years ago we passed Senate Bill 95 out. The Governor signed it. It was an attempt to put back into some kind of reasonable funding for our retirement systems throughout the State of Illinois. The first year we did not fund it; this is the second year it has not been planned to fund. It is a serious matter. Next year it will be over \$400,000,000 will be delinquent,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

and I'd say in eight to ten years the whole system is going to be in a major catastrophe. The state is already, recently...had a suit filed against them because we have not attempted to maintain the...statute by the Bills I'm offering this Bill of a \$100...this Amendment, which would fund fully this year a \$154,000,000 an intent. really think that we ought to do it; Ι however, in the best interests of attempting to maintain some kind of a rational approach to funding, I understand, and I think every Member in this chamber understands, that we do not have this money, though I think we all ought to say, 'We've got to take a look and this, Ladies and This has to be funded soon, but at this time, I will withdraw this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 886, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Andrew McGann, on House Bill 886."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

House Bill 886 is the teachers' retirement, and...we had to reduce the amounts in order to comply with the State Board of Education request and also to try to have some cooperative approach with the Governor of the State, in his level of funding that he requested. I think that Representative Ropp and his Amendment, and I appreciate him withdrawing that Amendment, was very, very on target.

We've passed legislation before to that mandated the support of these pension systems. Presently on this House

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill 886, we have...reducing the downstate teachers' retirement by \$154,000,000 and we are reducing the Chicago teachers' retirement \$85,000,000. Some \$100,000. I would ask for passage of House Bill 886 and this appropriation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 886 and on that, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Mautino: "Representative McGann, would you please, once again announce the cuts that you've made in this budget as presented to us? Did you say \$124,000,000, from the downstate teachers and \$54,000,000, from the...what are your numbers again, please?"

McGann: "Well the total amount in the reduction is \$239,599,200.

It reduced the downstate teachers retirement by \$154,147,000 and it reduced the Chicago teachers retirement by \$85,452,200. This was in compliance with the request of the State Board of Education and also to keep it within the requested Governor's level of funding?"

Mautino: "And what percentage of pay-out...what's the total amount of that Bill now?"

McGann: "The total amount of the Bill, presently, will be, if passes this Assembly, will be \$294,670,400."

Mautino: "That's about 35% of pay-out, isn't it, or less? What percentage of pay-out is that?

McGann: "I would say it's roughly about anywheres...and don't hold me, I don't have a calculator...maybe 42 to 44% of funding."

Mautino: "What was it last year?"

McGann: "Pardon me?"

Mautino: "What was it last year?"

McGann: "Last year was...I'll have it in just a moment for you,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

but it was reduced roughly 40 some percent."

Mautino: "Okay, so if I remember correctly, four years ago we were funding at about 51%, last year about 48% and now you're recommending that we fund at 35%?"

McGann: "No, I believe that you're talking of around 42 or 44%."

Mautino: "42 or 44% of pay-out? May I ask why?"

"Well...I really don't think, Representative, that McGann: really have to ask that question. We just do not have the dollars. If we had the dollars, I'd be the first one who want to put it into their pension fund, but we don't have that \$154,000,000 to do what we want and we don't have the \$85,000,000 to do what we want. We just don't have the dollars. We had the people come in from the retirement system and it might be a good it might be good information for everybody in the Assembly about prolonging this but they gave us projections that if we continue on the course that we are on right now, we will have depleted the teachers' retirement by 2015. The year 2015, there will be nothing left if we continue to go as we are, but under the present circumstances, I agree with you wholeheartedly, we should be funding it 100%, but we're not funding it. Nobody's said 60%, we're not funding it there, but there are no other dollars. We have to do what we got. This is the best we can do in this given year."

Mautino: "Two quick followups, if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Mautino: "Number one is, you stated that is the recommendation of the State Board of Education that we would reduce, by those levels, the pension fund? Was that your statement? And #2, did the Governor's budget come in at that reduction level? #1 you said..."

McGann: "I'm giving you the answer. Excuse me, it's going to be...Representative Mautino, in 91, the funding level was

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

\$299,141,900. The funding this year is \$294,670,400. It's about four point something million dollars difference over...from last year. Last year we gave four point some million more than we are this year."

Mautino: "Yes, but you're, the reductions that you've made, have been \$145,000,000 from downstate and fifty from Chicago and there's a \$4,000,000 differential. That just doesn't add up."

McGann: "No. \$85,000,000 for Chicago."

Mautino: "And that was the Governor's recommended level in his budget appropriation?"

McGann: "It was the Governor's recommended level, and it was also the projection in and the...request of the...State Board of Education."

Mautino: "We are digging ourselves one great big deep hole."

McGann: "I totally agree. I totally agree with you, Representative."

Mautino: "I mean..."

McGann: "You have no problem with me."

Mautino: "This is absolutely ridiculous, what we're about to do here."

McGann: "Well, when this General Assembly comes around to meeting their obligations for everything and starts saying we're going to have to have more of the income tax and we're also going to have to have the Governor to cooperate, then we will be carrying out our responsibility. In the meantime, we have to work with what dollars we got; this is all we have to work with."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is probably one of the toughest votes you're going to have all Session, and it breaks my heart to have to vote for this thing because I'm a teacher, I come

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

from teachers, I've got a lot of great retired teachers in my district, but the previous speaker and some of you over on the other side of the aisle who voted 'yes' Attorney General's appropriation to give him 39 new positions, a new computer system to the tune of almost \$4.5 million dollars ought to wonder how you are going to explain back home to your retired teachers that you gave all this new money to the AG's office and shortchanged the retired teachers. This is a tough job, the Chairman's done a rough job, he's done the best he can with the limited resources, but we simply do not have the \$239,000,000 we ought to have to catch us up. All we can do is promise to do better, but the money has got to come from somewhere, and, reluctantly, I think we've got to push...this budget out of here the way it is, but with the idea that one of these days, we are going to have to pay the piper and reimburse what we owe the retirement systems because we can't continue this for very long."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 886 Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 87 'ayes', 9 'nays', 11 answering 'present', and House Bill 886 having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Myron Kulas for an announcement. Representative Kulas? The announcement?"

Kulas: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The House Energy Environment Committee which was supposed to meet tomorrow morning at 8:30, that meeting is canceled. So all Members of the Energy Environment Committee, the 8:30 meeting tomorrow is canceled."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll back up to the Order, back up to House

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Bill 808, Hicks. The Clerk will read the Bill, 808."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 808. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #4 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on Amendment #5."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 to House Bill 808 reduces GRF request from the '91 level of \$3,094,755 with a reduction of \$534,145. It also increases the appropriation authority...for county funds by \$137,000, from \$137,191 to \$1,416,000. It does several other things in changing dollars around, and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #5."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 and on that Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do not rise to oppose the Amendment or rather but inform for those of you that are interested in the Child Witness Program. The Child Witness Program has been or would be, reduced by this Amendment. It would reduce the amount of appropriation from \$120,000 to \$10,000. Obviously, we have to make cuts in a lot of places, but I only rise so that you understand...that if you vote in favor that you are voting for that cut."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryder on Amendment #6.
 Withdrawn. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 808, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of State Attorneys Appellate Prosecutor. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks on House Bill 808."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for an
 'aye' vote on House Bill 808."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 808 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, my light has been lit on the Amendment and now on this. I'm sorry I wasn't recognized. I'm voting 'present' on this because of the comments made by the previous speaker regarding the reduction in the...witness victim program which has been one of the most successful programs in the State of Illinois to detraumatize the court process for juveniles who have to testify in court and it will reduce that appropriation, we will diminish the training of judges and prosecutors on how to make it possible for young people to actually show up in court and testify. For that reason, I am voting 'present', and I hope in the Senate they will be smarter than we are here in the House and put that money back in."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 'ayes', 0 'nays', 3 answering 'present', and House Bill 808, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 887, McGann. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 887. This Bill has been read the second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Weaver."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Weaver on Amendment #2."

- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 2 restores the dollars cut from primarily the general state aid formula in committee back to the original Governor's submitted level. It will take the estimated foundation level up by \$56 per student to \$2,557 per student, a total of \$29.9 million dollars over the Fiscal Year '91 level. The only other major change it makes is reduces about a million and a half dollars funding for district consolidations. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Weaver has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. On that, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. worked very, very well with Representative Weaver in the Education Approp. Committee this year, and I understand where he is coming from and why he is coming from with this Amendment #2, but I must stand in opposition to this Amendment because, number one, we felt as though we needed to allocate the given dollars and the increase in funding which was given by the Governor in his original budget. We ought to keep the other programs going. They were good They're needed programs, and that's why we made this adjustment. This adjustment was passed unanimously on both sides of the aisle. Other third parties opportunity to make their case known. The case was not I must stand in opposition to Amendment made known. and I would ask for 'no' votes."
- Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of Amendment say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'nos' have it, and the Amendment fails.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 837...887, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Andrew McGann on House Bill 887."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. House Bill 887 as you see it now on Third Reading is the Fiscal Year 1992 budget request for the State Board of Education, and it increases the general state aid by \$19,246,500 still keeping within the Governor's requested level of funding for total education appropriation, and I would ask for passage of House Bill 887."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 887. On that, the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although we have some minor disagreements in terms of the mix, the bottom line is the same. We made a commitment to both sides of the aisle during committee that we would attempt to keep the bottom line as close to submission as possible. I think we've done that. I appreciate the tremendous amount of work Representative McGann has...has done in this committee, and I endorse the passage of this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 887 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 104 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 887, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1048, Homer. Schoenberg, 'aye', and Schakowsky,

- 54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991
 'aye'. House Bill 1048, Homer. The Clerk will read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1048. It's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Any Motions or..."
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions...no Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Homer."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Withdraw Amendment 3? Oh, out of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 1155, Hannig. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Hannig: "House Bill 1155 has been read a second time previously.

 A Motion to table House Amendment #1 is filed by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanniq."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 We've heard this argument on the Attorney General's budget,
 again on the State Treasurer's budget. The Treasurer came
 in with a...a fairly conservative budget, quite frankly,
 but we did provide that we cut \$66,500 out of the budget
 that he had recommended in committee. He has subsequently
 asked that we restore that money. In all fairness to our
 new Treasurer, I think that we should do that, and so I'm
 moving that we table House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved to table House
 Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed...I'm sorry,
 Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In committee, both sides of the aisle agreed to eliminate the \$66,500 for merit comp increases, but now by tabling, what the Sponsor is saying is that's too much. Is he going to be able to...unable to carry out his job without this \$66,000? I think not. I go back to the comments earlier...merit comp increases.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

They're just not around this year in 98% and 9/10 or something like that of the agencies, but here we go again. You'd think that the Treasurer, an elected official of the State of Illinois, would understand the tight fiscal crisis. But no, he can't get by without this \$66,000, while we're cutting millions out of all other kinds of state programs. Ten years ago this very person, for the reasons of being more efficient, led the attack to cut back the size of this House. Sixty—six thousand dollars, he can't be efficient? Sixty—six thousand dollars? Your vote should be 'no' on the tabling of this Amendment. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of the tabling say 'aye',
 opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion to table
 Amendment #1 prevails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 was adopted in committee.

 Amendment #3 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Hannig and Robert Olson."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig withdraws Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 is being offered by Robert
 Olson."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson on Amendment 5."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 eliminates the 4% COLA increase for 47 union employees, for a total reduction of \$71,000 in General Revenue Funds. It eliminates merit compensation for non-union, non-code employees for \$66,500 General Revenue Funds...reduces contractual services, postage lines are left the same. It's a reduction of \$36,000, and reduces the travel line by \$24,000. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're getting towards the end of the day as far as the Appropriation Bills. For the most part we stuck pretty close to the work that came out of committee. If

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

you will vote for Amendment #5, you are again staying pretty close to the work that came out of committee to the way this particular appropriation to the Treasurer's Office read before Amendment #1 was tabled. I urge the adoption of Amendment #5 on a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. On that, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It sounds like deja vu all over again. You know, this is the Treasurer, the Gentleman who issues the checks. heard the arguments, well, what if the checks don't go out? Well. the Treasurer is the fellow who issues those checks. But, you know, we've heard the crocodile tears about how we're going to put \$150,000,000 been proposed from that side of the aisle, into a pension fund when we know we don't have the money. We wish we did, but we're just talking about giving the Treasurer of the State of Illinois a budget that he can live with and that's all that we're trying to do. So this Amendment I think is more political than anything else. It's trying to...trying to hamstring the Treasurer's Office so that he can't do a good job over the next four years, and I submit that we should not be doing that here in this Assembly, and I ask that we...that we defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman...Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I wasn't going to speak on this Amendment, but I had to after that last speaker got up. Here we go again. We're sending the wrong message to the folks back home. We're trying to convince them we're in a state of fiscal meltdown, and we turn around and give merit and comp increases to a Constitutional officer. We turn around and give him payroll increases. We turn around and give him more people. It's the wrong message to send

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

to the folks that are going to have to bite the bullet this summer or next fall. I think we need to approve this Amendment to...to show a little fiscal responsibility."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman, Representative Olson, has moved for the passage...or the adoption...Representative Olson...I'm sorry."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to close."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright."

Olson: "First, I would like to say to Representative Hannig that it's been a real pleasure at the half way mark to have served with you on the General Services Appropriation I'm sorry that we're disagreeing on the last Committee. item that you and I are going to be addressing here today, but two things were said. Crocodile tears...crocodile tears. Let me tell you in those 1,400 state employees that are going to be laid off across our state at Mental Health and Corrections and other places, those tears they're going to cry when they go home and tell their wife and their children won't be crocodile tears. They won't be crocodile tears. They're going to be the real McCoy. We're not playing fair with those people when we allow merit increases other places. We're not being fair, and we all Another statement that. was just made Representative Hannig, besides crocodile tears, that it was Believe you me, Ladies and Gentlemen, election time I can be very political, but here today I'm talking about being fair play amongst the employees of the State of Illinois, fair play in the appropriation process. Mr. Speaker, I urgently ask...plea...that we put some 'yes' votes up on Amendment #5. Have a Roll Call, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Black, the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Gentleman from Vermilion to explain his vote."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, here we go. We...we can't...we aren't paying our hospital providers. We don't know whether we're going to be able to continue general assistance. We don't have any idea if the surcharge is going to be extended. We don't even know if the Bill will be called, and here you are voting to extend the Treasurer's budget to his fully requested amount, merit pay, pay raises and travel. know, this is the same Gentleman that said this Body wasn't very efficient, and he reduced its size ten years ago. Well, you know something? If you vote to restore his budget, maybe he's right. Maybe we weren't efficient ten years ago, and, by golly, maybe we aren't very efficient even today, because if this is the way we're going to set priorities, then the Gentleman down in the Treasurer's Office must have been right ten years ago."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Take the record. On this question there are 47 'ayes', 64 'nays', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Bob Olson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Olson on Amendment #6."

Olson: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Matijevich: "Withdraw Amendment #6. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1155, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig on House Bill 1155."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Bill increases the General Revenue Fund \$12,107,000 last year to \$12,686,000 this year. It also is a change from non-General Revenue Fund of \$527,714 to \$553,207,000. So obviously there is a significant amount non-General Revenue Fund in the State Treasurer's budget. Let me simply point out that the State Treasurer this budget is actually reducing his headcount by six employees. So we're not seeing an individual coming in here asking to add a bunch of new people to his payroll. In fact, he's making a very...a very good effort to try to reduce the headcount and reduce the amount of people that run that office. So I would ask you today to join with me sending to the Senate this Bill, the appropriation Bill for the State Treasurer, the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 'ayes', 39 'nays', 4 On this question there are 67 'present'. Bill 1155...Marinaro, answering House 'aye'...Marinaro...and House Bill 1155, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Important announcement for Cub fans. It has just been reported, Popeye's gone. Zimmer is no longer the manager. At least that's the report I've been given here. House Bill 1878, McPike, CDB. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1878 has been read a second time previously. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

 Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1878, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1878

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 1878, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1917, Currie. Read the Bill.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1917 has been read a second time previously. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Saltsman, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Saltsman: "Yes, I was away from my desk, and I didn't get a chance to hit my button in time, and I want to be recorded as I would have voted 'yes' on the last Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. It will be so recorded. Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1917, a Bill for an Act appropriating moneys to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Currie on House Bill 1917."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Bill appropriates one dollar to the Department of Public Aid. It was introduced at the behest of children's hospitals, and I would appreciate your 'aye' votes to move the Bill to the Senate. Certainly the Bill will move no further unless there is some kind of agreement to help the hospitals that do the perinatal work and deal with ill children in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Currie has moved for the passage of House Bill 1917. On that, Representative Ryder, did you...Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's been a significant number of vehicle Bills that have already gone to the Senate, and we don't believe that one more would be of

54th Legislative Day

Black: "I

May 21, 1991

help, and we, therefore, oppose the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Lady has moved for the passage Bill 1917. All οf House in favor 'aye'...opposed...vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. Have all Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 33 'nays', 6 answering 'present', and House Bill 1917, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, I'm sorry. Your light was on. failed to see it."

just have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I...I

don't think many people heard and understand the gravity of the announcement that you made awhile ago. If indeed...if indeed, the manager of a certain baseball club on the northside of Chicago has been summarily dismissed, probably without due cause, I would suggest the House immediately adjourn so that we can go across the street and get this worked out, and I know there are several people in chamber who would want to put their application in right away. I'm...I'm so shocked and upset, I don't know if I can continue, Mr. Speaker. I think we should adjourn immediately. There's obviously turmoil at Wrigley Field." Matijevich: "The Chair will Speaker take under...Representative Black, you wouldn't know it. I've been a Cub fan since 1932, and last night...and much as I like Don Zimmer, last night I was with Don Saltsman, and I said they ought to get rid of him. Believe it or

Daniels: "What else would you expect from a second-rate team?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I hope...I hope...I hope Representative

Ryder is a Cub fan, but he wants recognition. I think he's

a Cardinal fan, though."

Minority Leader has some comments, I believe."

not. That was last night. Representative Daniels, the

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Ryder: "I would just...I would just have an inquiry of the Chair.

 Since you've been a Cubs fan since 1932, I was wondering
 how many World Series that you have attended on behalf of
 the Cubs."
- Speaker Matijevich: "19...1945...We'll go back to House Bill 1048. Representative Wyvetter Younge, were you seeking recognition?"
- Younge: "Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. We have a distinguished American here with us today, Maria Tribual, of Belleville, and the St. Clair County NOW, and they are having a reception in Room 400 at 5:00 o'Clock. Would you please welcome the St. Clair County NOW?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Wel...welcome. Return to House Bill 1048.

 The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1048 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in committee.

 No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Homer."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative...Representative Homer on Floor Amendment #3."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment 3 eliminates \$175,000 GRF because that amount has already been added to the Criminal Justice Information Authority FY'92 appropriation. So the matter had been duplicated in two budgets. We would...we would move for the adoption of Amendment 3 to take it out of the Appellate Defender's budget."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We join in this attempt to cut the budget by a responsible amount. The Gentleman's doing the right thing, and we would join in support of this

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer on Floor Amendment #4."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would add \$164,163 to provide one staff attorney with associated costs in each of the Appellate Defender Districts, there being five in all, in order to handle the newly increased duties...that we are prescribing to them in other legislation, namely House Bill 1950, which will require the Appellate Defender to represent not only felons on appeal but also misdemeanants when the court has appointed a (sic an) appellate counsel to represent an indigent qualifies. Without this service by the Appellate Defender, the burden for representation of these misdemeanants would fall upon the individual counties who...where the Circuit Judges would have to appoint special counsel and pay for that out of the county's general fund. This is much more efficient...a much better way to handle it. The Appellate Defender's Office was created, in fact, to consolidate and handle the appeals that come out of the circuit courts and so by mandating that they do so, as the law provides, we have a responsibility to provide the appropriate funds that this Amendment would provide them for one additional staff person and costs in each of the districts. I would answer questions and move the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

question?

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he will."

Ryder: "Representative, you were doing so good. You cut \$175,000 out for the budget, and now you're adding back \$164,000. What went wrong?"

Homer: "There's a net gain of \$10,000, and..."

Ryder: "But we were \$175,000 to the good. Representative, I'm disappointed in the last two Amendments. You go from a good Amendment to a bad Amendment. What happened?"

Homer: "What happened is that we're trying to exercise our responsibility to adequately fund those...those responsibilities that we assigned to this office. So that's what we're doing."

Ryder: "Representative, you're hiring an additional person in each of the judicial districts throughout the state. Is that right?"

Homer: "The Appellate Defender's Office is, yes."

Ryder: "And how many people is that? I don't know how many districts there are."

Homer: "Five. Five. There will be five...five total, one in each office. Five districts."

Ryder: "And these five that you would be hiring. Would they perhaps be attorneys?"

Homer: "Yes, they would be."

Ryder: "To the...to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. We're setting our priorities at hiring attorneys when we don't have enough guards in jails? We're hiring attorneys when we don't have enough probation officers? If that's the way we want to have our priorities, you're entitled to make the vote, but I'm requesting a Roll Call so we can keep track of it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question...Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that Members would

not fall for the demagoguery that...that

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

spews from the

other side about this issue. The fact of the matter is...is that the...by virtue of the United States Illinois law, Constitution and when an indigent is convicted of a felony or certain misdemeanors, entitled, as a matter of law, to the appointment of counsel on appeal. Now the only question is, 'Who will pay for that?' Either we do the responsible thing and have the Appellate Defender handle those appeals which they can do much more expeditiously and at much less cost or we turn our back on the Appellate Defender and tell the counties to go ahead and pay for it themselves...to appoint special counsel from the ranks of the bar in those counties to receive a higher legal fee than we would be paying by having the Appellate Defender handle this. So, actually if you want to talk about voting for lawyer bills, if you vote against this Amendment, then what you're voting for is to spend more of the counties, money to hire local attorneys to do the job that the Appellate Defender's Office is particularly situated to handle. So, the responsible vote, and the vote that will end up costing the taxpayers less money, is a 'yes' vote to allow the Appellate Defender to do the job that it's required to do. I urge a 'yes' vote." Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 61 'ayes', 44 'nays', 2 answering 'present'. The Amendment is

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1048, a Bill for an Act making

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

appropriations to the Office of State Appellate Defender. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer on the Bill."

Homer: "Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1048 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 8 'nos', 2 answering 'present'. House Bill 1048, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Keane in the Chair."
- Speaker Keane: "On the Special Call, 2:00 p.m., Abortion Prohibition, Third Reading vote on House Bill 622. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 18 of the Calendar. House Bill 622, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 622 is a Bill that prevents abortion except in certain cases after five and a half months viability. What it does is...is unless it is necessary to prevent either the death of a pregnant woman or the substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function of the woman, then that...that abortion It does not address, change, or not be permitted. define as to what viability is. That stage...when we take a look at viability right now, viability is five and a half months. That remains precisely the same. What we are addressing in this Bill is simply that the law as it is now covers emotional matters, family matters and woman's age as reasons for abortion after five and a half months. law changes that to say that only when bodily...major

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

bodily function that deals with such things as the brain, the heart, lungs, kidney, liver, et cetera, and physicians normally know what those major bodily functions are, then those...those abortions cannot be permitted unless they deal with the brain, hearts, lungs, kidney or liver, et cetera. I would certainly entertain any questions on this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Currie: "So, my understanding, Representative, is that if a woman were about to lose both kidneys, that the doctor could certify that she'd lose both kidneys if she carried this pregnancy to term, then under your Bill she could have an abortion after fetal viability. Is that right?"

McNamara: "That is correct."

Currie: "If a woman has serious diabetes and may be at great risk of kidney failure but the doctor can't certify that the kidney failure is bound to happen, then under your Bill she may not have a late-term abortion. Is that right?"

McNamara: "I...I will answer it in this way. The physicians know what the major bodily functions are. If that major bodily function is going to be a result of her death, then, in his opinion, then, yes, she could have that. If not, then no. I will not put myself in the place of a physician in order to determine that medical situation."

Currie: "If a woman is, oh, I don't know, mid-forties and is at risk of heart disease and the doctor thinks that a pregnancy, a late-term pregnancy may subject her to serious risk of a heart attack but can't guarantee that it will, would that woman be permitted to have a late-term abortion under your Bill?"

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

McNamara: "No, it would not. She would not be permitted to have the abortion under that circumstance as I have gone personally through that trauma."

Currie: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Ι think the Gentleman's answer to my second question is correct. A doctor may be pretty sure that a woman who's developed heart disease at age 44 or 37 may discover during the course of the pregnancy that she's at substantial risk heart failure if she carries the pregnancy to term. Now that's a tough situation for any woman, for any family to be in, but under the terms of House Bill 622, there is one option that is not available to that family, to avoid substantial risk of heart failure and death that woman and her family may not, under this Bill, choose abortion. would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the Gentleman's answer to my previous question is wrong as I read his Bill. Under his Bill, if a woman with diabetes in the view of her doctor may be subject to kidney failure, it is not at all clear that she would be permitted to have a late-term abortion under the terms of House Bill 622. The Sponsor suggested that doctors know. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, doctors know a lot better than There are very few abortions performed in this country after viability. Less than one percent of all abortions occur at that time, and when they occur, they occur because there is a serious threat to the health and the life of the mother, and it is the woman and her family and the doctor that are in the better position to make that judgment than we in this Assembly. This is an effort to overturn existing Roe versus. Wade language. There's no question this goes well beyond what the court in Roe versus. Wade permitted the states to do. The point here is to offer up Illinois as one more test case and require the state, if

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

this Bill becomes law, to spend hundreds and thousands of dollars in order to interfere in issues that doctors, the Sponsor admits, are in the best place to decide. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, that if you value the right of families to make very tough decisions in late-term pregnancies and they...the only kind of decisions about abortion we're talking about in term pregnancies are those in which the health and the life of the mother are at risk. I would urge you to leave things the way they are. Leave the questions to the physicians who are making that determination along with the mother and her family. I would urge you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this chamber, to reject House Bill 622."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Balanoff."

"Mr....Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The government has no place in the private lives of the citizens of Illinois. I don't like abortions. Nobody likes abortions, but every woman has the right to make her own hard choices at any point in her pregnancy. The reality exists that in society today there is a need for safe, legal abortions. The decision of choice is personal one which must be left to the woman and a man, a clergyman, family members, a doctor, her Lord, or with whomever she would choose, whenever she chooses. Ιt is not one that can or should be made in the dimly lit halls of the Legislature. There are thousands of children right now who are crying out to be adopted with no parents forward, and every day in this Legislature Bills are defeated to feed the hungry, house the homeless, and increase funding for education. Unfortunately, many of those who will vote for this Bill call themselves pro-life, that is until the baby is born, because then they are the ones who would deny that baby food, shelter and a decent

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

education. In closing, I would just reiterate that government has no place in that very personal and difficult right of choice. I oppose House Bill 622, and I urge my colleagues to vote 'no' and let freedom ring."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Currie quoted you the statistic that less than one percent of abortions take place in the last trimester. That is true. Ninety percent take place in the first trimester. Only about nine percent take place in the second trimester. This is much ado about nothing, this legislation. I would like to urge those of you who recognize that you have a conflict of interest in that your constituents...your constituents support the availability of abortion to the women of Illinois, and if you find you cannot vote to support their concerns, I suggest to you that you should vote 'present' or go check out the lobby. I think very important that you recognize the needs of the women of Illinois on this very important issue. Please vote 'present' if you cannot vote 'no'."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House. Those of us in this General Assembly who have had the privilege of carrying a life within their body, the joy of feeling life, would know that it is impossible to even contemplate ending that pregnancy if there were not dire circumstance that required it. legislation assures that that decision is made with great deliberation of the family and the physician, and never, ever, made lightly. I think this Bill implies that...that women would frivolously decide to end pregnancy after viability. Nothing could be further from the truth. There are currently enough protections for

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

mother, for the child, for the family and for the relationship between physician and patient, and I urge you, out of respect for women and the children, that you would vote against this legislation."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Why don't we maintain some perspective on this issue and acknowledge this...this proposed change in the law for all that it is, and that is this. Since the passage of the original Act and others like it, the courts have construed the term health to include the mental health of the mother. That, in turn, has allowed late abortions, abortions where the fetus is, in reasonable judgment, viable for the mental well-being or the health, the mental health of the mother. The law was intended to allow as an exception to the general rule in cases where the physical health is endangered. That's the entire purpose for this Amendment. It is to make clear what had always been the intent that it is not the mental health or well-being of the mother against whom we will balance the life of the unborn child, it is the physical health only, and that is what this Bill does."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Yeah. Representative can you, perhaps, shed some light on this by answering a question? If, for example, my wife was just entering into the third trimester and on a routine visit to the doctor, the doctor said because of a bad heart or a kidney problem that she was in...severe distress and indeed if...if the pregnancy was carried to term could result in her death and in...and in her doctor's opinion the termination of that pregnancy was necessary to save her

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

life, could she then have the abortion?"

McCracken: "It is my impression under this Bill that she could."

Black: "Thank you very much."

McCracken: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of this chamber. House Bill 622 is a horrendous piece Abortion is rightfully an issue that should legislation. be determined by women, their doctor, and their Three-fourths of us in this chamber do not fit either one of those categories. Our concerns as a legislative Body should not be to erode the existing standards that govern abortion, but, instead, we need to be concentrating on how we can safely ensure that our existing laws are adhered to. This will ensure that the integrity of the process is protected as well as the lives of the women involved and their mental health. I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to vote 'no' against this legislation that would take us back to a time when the people who voted for laws were white, male, 21, and owned property. We now have the rights and the power to govern our own lives, and I ask you to vote 'no' against this legislation."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Hultgren: "Representative McNamara, in your opening remarks, I understood you to say that viability is at five and a half months. Did I...was I following your remarks correctly?"

McNamara: "That's correct."

Hultgren: "My question, Representative McNamara, is, 'Where does that standard come from?' Is that...it...it's not in the Bill, is it? Or...or can you tell me where that definition of viability..."

McNamara: "No. Yes."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hultgren: "That's what I'm concerned about, where...where you came up with that definition of viability."

McNamara: "Okay. Viability is...is already defined in the...in the abortion law, Illinois abortion law, and...or, excuse me, it's...it's in the abortion law, and it...it's defined as 'that stage of fetal development when in medical judgment of the attending physician based on the particular facts of the case before him, there is reasonable likelihood of sustained survival of this...of the fetus outside the womb with or without artificial support'. Now that is a definition that has been accepted by the Supreme Court for viability. This Bill in no way changes the term viability."

Hultgren: "Well, thank you. Then...then if I may follow up on that because it seems to me relevant to this legislation, what...what is sustained viability...what is sustained life outside...in other words, what would it have to be sustained life? What...what period of time?"

McNamara: "Okay. Apparently what is now is a gestational period apparently right now it is approximately...approximately five and a half months. In reality it's somewhere in the area of 23 1/2 weeks or so."

Hultgren: "Well, you said the definition of viability was an ability to be sustained outside the womb, is that..."

McNamara: "Outside of the fetus."

Hultgren: "Is that...is that permanent sustenance?"

McNamara: "Pardon?"

Hultgren: "Is that permanently sustained? Is that what that means?"

McNamara: "My...my impression is, is if that life is sustained, it is permanently sustained. That's my definition. I am not proporting to give any other definition to the Bill than what is included in the Supreme Court."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

- Hultgren: "I...I understand. So, currently, with medical
 technology, that period of time is five and a half months?"
 McNamara: "That's correct."
- Hultgren: "Would it...is it conceivable then that with changes in medical technology that period might be four and a half months or three and a half months or two and a half months if medical technology would improve?"
- McNamara: "I will not enter into an ifs, ands, or buts conversation on it since it's something that I cannot address factually. However, if the sustained life provision were to be changed, it would be changed by the Supreme Court, not by the courts of Illinois, not by myself."
- Hultgren: "Well, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the Bill. The fact of the matter is that the definition of viability, which the Sponsor has referenced in Illinois law, is one which is dependent upon the current state of medical technology, and, in fact, we've seen that medical technology change in the period of time since the Supreme Court decision in Rowe versus. Wade, and with changes in medical technology in the future, then, in fact, the period of viability may be reduced from five and a half to four and a half to three and a half to two and a half months to a point where there will be no right of women to choose this method of reproductive choice. I think for that reason alone this is a (sic an) ill—advised concept, and we should vote 'no'."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Keane: "We just have one more to testify. Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

House. Abortion is the destruction of a human being. This Bill takes a very modest step forward in protecting some unborn children. It is a very modest Bill that certainly does not deserve all of the hysteria that has been raised around it, but it would be a step forward for Illinois law, and I urge you to vote 'yes' and choose life. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McNamara to close."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question on this Bill is viable life. When you're talking about..."

Speaker Keane: "Representative...Representative McNam...Representative McNamara could you hold? Representative Williams, for what purpose do you rise?"

Williams: "I had rose for debate. I didn't know that he was about to close."

Speaker Keane: "The debate had been...the debate had been closed.

You can explain your vote."

Williams: "I'll explain it at the proper time."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Let's start again...that it is...this Bill deals with viable life. When you are taking a look at something so sacred as a life, anything that terminates a viable life obviously is a murder. It is taking that life that is able to live outside of the woman's womb, and it is ceasing that life. There were many cases that said that while, first of all, that only one percent would be involved in this. That's absolutely true. There are only one percent. There will be approximately 550 to 600 abortions addressed in this Bill. Anything that we can do in order to save a life of a human being is very important. To say that the viable life will be reduced so that the viability of that life becomes even earlier doesn't make any sense at all so that it would not allow...allow people for abortions. What is important is that anytime a life is viable, it must be

May 21, 1991 54th Legislative Day protected. We are here to protect life, not to act as God, saying who may...who may die and who may live. I urge

an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Williams, to explain your vote."

Williams: "Yes. rise in opposition to Ι this particular Amendment on the...reality of that...when we talk about a life the question becomes, 'Whose life?' and under what situations are we valuing the life, not just of the fetus but the...what the fetus will endure after life, what mother must endure if, in fact, she finds herself in the health situation is not covered by this Bill. People who don't have to live with it, don't have the moral right to make the decision that they are making here today, say that this particular Amendment and this particular Bill is not right at this time. We know that, in fact, a person's health can be impaired to such a state that may not be able to viably take care of an individual...that their life may be in jeopardy other than what is stated by this particular Bill. You're trying to narrow the scope, and you're trying to invade a decision that is not ours to make. We do not stand in the shoes of the Almighty. We do not have the right to stand up here today and make the decisions of the Almighty or of the woman who is involved in a life and death situation that only she can discuss and her health is her business. We must not invade privacies of those individuals. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Lang: rise in opposition to this...this very bad Bill. It's bad for a number οf reasons. First of all, the Bill is...the Bill is very

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

vaque. It talks about viability. Who decides viability? We can't expect doctors and women in...in the privacy of their doctor's office to determine whether the fetus viable. We can't expect them to interpret Supreme Court or other court decisions to determine what's viable. Bill starts out being vague. What the Bill attempts to do is not so simple as some have suggested. This Bill is not simply a situation that's created. What it is is...is attempt to go way back before Rowe versus. Wade. It's an attempt to go back to the Dark Ages on this Nobody...nobody wants really to have a situation office where...women and doctors in the privacy of their need to consult other parties to make decisions about whether their..."

Speaker Keane: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Lang: "Thank you. Nobody wants to leave that decision to a doctor. The doctors don't even want that decision. The Medical Society's against this Bill. Please reconsider your votes if you voted green and vote 'no'."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is only meant to create mischief. We already have a definition that has served us well for many years. If we make a change like this, who can say what is irreversible damage to an organ of a woman? Medical advances are being made in all directions, not only in terms of being able to save the life of a fetus but to be able to reverse many things that used to be irreversible. This Bill is meant to muddy the waters, to make it more difficult for any doctor to be able to perform an abortion and to make it more miserable for women who need to have an abortion If there were some indication that the safety sake. process currently in effect is really being abused,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

perhaps a change would be..."

Speaker Keane: "The Lady will bring her remarks to a close. The question is, 'The...have all voted who wish?' Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 58 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Keane: "Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: DeJaegher. Deuchler.

Manny Hoffman. Klemm. Laurino. Marinaro and Rotello. No
further."

Speaker Keane: "Anyone wish to change their votes? On this Bill, there are 59...Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Keane: "You want it on Postponed Consideration?"

McNamara: "Yes, I'll take...I'll take a Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Keane: "The Bill is on Postponed Consideration. We will now proceed to the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading. On that Order is House Bill 17, Representative Lang. Representative Lang, do you want to call House Bill 17? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 17, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to judicial salaries. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. House Bill 313, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill...out of the record."

Speaker Keane: "House Bill 947, Representative Trotter.

Representative Trotter. Out of the record. House Bill
757, Representative McGann. Out of the record. House Bill
832, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Second Reading, State and Local Government. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 832, a Bill for an Act to amend various Acts in relation to riverboat gambling. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 was tabled previously. Floor
Amendment #3, offered by Representative Sieben."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Sieben."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Amendment #3 does it...it actually becomes the Bill, and it deletes the exemption from the Open Meetings Act for the information relating solely to the internal rules and practices of the Gaming Board. I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. We are working on an agreement with the Gaming Board and putting together a lot of provisions and...would ask that the Sponsor of this Amendment withdraw this...this Amendment or we defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Sieben."

Sieben: "Well, in response to the Gentleman's suggestion that we withdraw this Amendment so that we can work out an agreement with the Gaming Board, I would ask that the Gentleman in...in the...in that process of working out the agreement would consult our side of the aisle. We would like to participate in that process of working out the agreements with the Gaming Board. I think we share many...we share many of the concerns that the Democrats do about the way the Gaming Board is functioning and some of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

the limits that they have in terms of the information they have been making available to the press, and...and we..."

Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, take this Bill out of the record.

- Speaker Keane: "The Bill...take the Bill out of the record. We'd like to recognize the presence of the...the Director of State Police, Terry Gainer, who's back with Representative LeFlore. If anyone has any tickets they want to give to them, they can do so now. Representative...Representative Hicks on House Bill 855. Out of the record. Representative Currie on 898. Out of the Representative Giorgi on 1117. Representative Representative Morrow. Would you stand aside? Representative Giorgi, 1117. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to riverboat gambling. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Out of the record. House Bill Representative Marinaro. Out of the record. House Bill 1587, Representative Lou Jones. Representative Lou Jones, do you want to call 185...1587? Out of the record. House Bill 1975, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 1976, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 2032, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 2186, Representative Trotter. Out of record. House Bill 2191, Representative Lang. Out of record. The Order of Special Call, Revenue. House Bill 2493, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2493, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. On Special Call, Family Law.
 House Bill 1351. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act to amend the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment represents the work of the...the Child Support Advisory Group with the Illinois Department of Public Aid in responding both to a Bill that we passed last Session and federal requirements that we review and revise child support quidelines at periodic intervals. Our current child support quidelines have been in effect since 1984. The Child Support Advisory Committee commissioned a study involving some experts on questions about what it costs to bring up children, what are other states doing, what's the appropriate conceptual scheme for establishing likely child support amounts, and we worked after the analysis by a professor of economics of the University Illinois, we worked with Circuit Judges, Legislators, legal representatives, child support advocates, the private bar, the recommendations from the...the consultant underwent major changes during that period, and finally what you see before you in House...in Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351 fairly clear consensus among these varieties of actors about which direction we ought to go. Not everybody happy with every part of the Amendment that you see before you, but basically the principles that are promoted in this Amendment is that both parents share responsibility for financial support of their children, that the assistance needs of each parent should be taken into account, but that the child support obligation should certainly be a priority that each child is entitled to share in the parents' standard of living and that the guidelines should be nondiscriminatory with regard to gender, guidelines should

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

not include economic disincentives for remarriage or for participation in the labor force, and that guidelines should encourage both parents to participate in the upbringing of their child. I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support for Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Preston: "Representative Currie, does this Amendment refer at all to the ability of the noncustodial parent going back into court asking for a review of the child support provisions after three years? Is that...is this that Amendment?"

Currie: "No, this is not that Amendment."

Preston: "Okay, and secondly, under the basic support obligation, how does this Amendment change that basic support obligation for the number of children between one and five?

I'm looking at what I think is the Amendment."

Currie: "The Amendment adopts new percentages. The percentage is lower in some instances than current percentages."

Preston: "I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker...excuse me. Hold on just a minute, Barbara."

Currie: "But the differences that the..."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, could you get order here because it's
 impossible to hear?"

Speaker Keane: "The point is well-taken."

Preston: "Representative Currie, could you continue? You said the percentages are different under this Amendment than they were under previous law?"

Currie: "The...the differences that the percentages in the Amendment would apply to adjusted gross rather than net income. So the percentages look different in at least some

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

respects, but they are applied to a different base."

Preston: "So they're higher, in other words?"

Currie: "The percentages are, we hope, higher..."

Preston: "Considerably higher?"

Currie: "...under this Bill than they were under the...the current law."

Preston: "Well, I...I'm looking under some of these numbers under...somebody has five children, the noncustodial parent here is to pay 40% of adjusted gross income. Wouldn't that amount to, after taxes, that somewhere in the neighborhood of 70% of that or more of that individual's income...he'd be living...he or she, whoever the noncustodial parent is...would be living on something in the neighborhood of 30% of their earned income."

Currie: "There, first of all, is a cap at 60%, and these percentages do not, unlike the way they do under current law apply to incomes above \$110,000. It is my understanding that these guidelines, were we to adopt them, would leave Illinois with only five states lower, in the percentages or the whatever scheme they use, lower in the statutory responsibility of parents to support their children following...divorce."

Preston: "Okay. Thank you."

Currie: "So, yes. The hope here is that the percentages will bring in somewhat more revenue for Illinois children. That is the problem that we're trying to resolve."

Preston: "Thank you, I...I think this is an Amendment that ought to be adopted, and I'd be glad to vote for it."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McCracken. Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "I believe in your opening remarks you indicated

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

that...the...percentages...were reduced in all categories because they...the standard is now adjusted gross income. Is that...was that your statement?"

Currie: "What I...what I said was that for some of the percentages may look as if we're going to bring in less money for children, and in those instances, for example, we go from...we go to 18% for one child from 20% for one child today, and I wanted people to understand that we were not...not, in fact, reducing the responsibility because the base..."

Dunn: "For one child that is so. The numbers do drop. For the second child, however, the current standard is 25%, of course, of net income, and this Amendment increases the percentage to 27% and makes it 27% of adjusted gross income. Isn't that a double whammy...a double increase?"

Currie: "Could I explain why we...why we chose to do that,

Representative? I mean was that a question, because I'd

be happy to..."

Dunn: "Yes."

Currie: "Alright. The reason is that on the basis of the work that our researchers, the economists from the University of Illinois, provided to us, our percentages were least responsive at the level of two children. That is, the actual costs of rearing two children were substantially more than the 5% addition that we apply in our present statute. So there was a...a real lack of parity and lack of adequacy in the current standard, and that is why the new percentage applied to two children would better reflect the actual costs of rearing that second child. Our current standard does not."

Dunn: "Were...somebody at the University of Illinois...arrived at these numbers then I guess is what you're saying."

Currie: "These were...it was her work that...and her group's work

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

that was the basis for our sorting among...these percentages are lower than..."

Dunn: "I have another question. What House Committee considered these...these standards? I don't recall seeing anywhere where this Bill was...this is in the form of a Bill that was considered by a House Committee...was there...what House Committee considered these numbers?"

Currie: "This Bill...the Bill was reported out of Children and Family Law Committee. It is true that the Amendment was not available to them. These percentages are a good deal lower than those that were recommended by our consultant on the basis of what children need..."

Dunn: "Now does this...does this Amendment further contain a provision that where there is more than one child and a child reaches...attains the age of majority that there cannot...that it prohibits a pro rata reduction in child support?"

Currie: "Sorry, prohibits what?"

Dunn: "As I read this Amendment, it provides that where there is an order for child support for more than one child, say three children, and the oldest child attains the age of majority, under current law you can provide that there will be a pro rata reduction in child support when one child becomes emancipated. As I read this Amendment this would prohibit that. Is that so?"

Currie: "That is not my understanding. If you would like to direct me to the language, it certainly was not my understanding that that's what this Amendment did."

Dunn: "Well, what is your position and intention then? Is it your intention that the current law should...should continue, that when a child attains the age 18 or is emancipated, whatever is the appropriate standard, that there shall be an opportunity for a pro rata reduction in

54th Legislative Day child support?"

May 21, 1991

Currie: "Well, my understanding would be that the number of children is reduced when...when one of the children has reached majority and so new percentages would apply. I will check that...I mean if you can point me to the language...we are on Second Reading, Representative, and I'd be happy further to investigate that question, but it's my understanding that the intent was not to continue child support for a 24-year-old."

Dunn: "I have a further question. The Amendment provides that the custodial parent's contribution, by reason of providing shelter and food and clothing, is by definition equal to...at least equal to that of the...of the noncustodial parent. What does IRS then say about who is entitled to take deductions on the income tax return and claim...or not...not maybe deductions but claim the child as a dependent for tax purposes...when, when this is statutorily prescribed?"

Currie: "There is an Amendment that is shortly to be offered by another Representative that will take that language out of the Bill."

Dunn: "Are you agreeable to that Amendment?"

Currie: "Personally, Representative, I'd be just as happy not to have it, but I will not oppose the Amendment."

Dunn: "You're capable of speaking up, Madam. I wish you would speak so we could all hear."

Currie: "I...I will not oppose that Amendment."

Dunn: "So you would support the Amendment that would take out the provision that defines the custodial parent's contribution is at least equal to that of noncustodial parents."

Currie: "I do not intend to stand in opposition to that Amendment."

Dunn: "Now, there is a cap on the...on the amount of child

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

support, isn't there, 60% of income...is that so?"

Currie: "That's right. Income up to \$110,000. Above \$110,000 these guidelines do not apply. That is not true under current law. That is the guidelines applied for all income..."

Dunn: "Is...is that regressive legislation that those of...of us who are unfortunately not able to...to earn over \$110,000 are subjected to 40, 50, 60, 70% of...of income regardless of circumstances, now. This is by definition that we're...we are subjected to...to that percentage of our income being taken from us, but if we...if we earn \$200,000 a year or \$150,000 a year these standards do not apply at all, isn't that so? And...and child support is...is a negotiable matter?"

Currie: "Well, Representative, I, myself, would have been happy to see the Bill proposed without this cap..."

Dunn: "Well, we have to talk..."

Currie: "...but as I said there was consensus among a variety of people coming from different places. The argument in favor of the cap is that..."

Dunn: "I wanted to clarify that...that above the cap there are no standards. Isn't that so?"

Currie: "There is language encouraging the court how to consider the income above \$110,000 and how to apply it to child support but the percentages do not apply, and the argument goes like this, Representative..."

Dunn: "Now, finally...finally I...fine, you can debate the Bill yourself. Finally, the question is, the standard against which the percentages are applied in this Amendment is adjusted gross income, is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Dunn: "And that is a different standard than is in the current law which is a...a net income?"

54th Legislative Day May 21, 1991

Currie: "That is correct."

Currie: "I believe that the current standard would take into account Social Security and the AGI would not, but under the new standard, under the AGI, health and hospitalization premiums can be deducted, and child support received by the absent parent."

Dunn: "And if...if you are self-employed..."

Currie: "I'm sorry...I'm sorry, reasonable and unnecessary...and necessary unreimbursed health care..."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I think I've asked enough questions. let me address this Amendment and probably will...this Amendment will probably succeed, but we ought to think about what we are doing here. The standards which we have in the statute books were presented in this same fashion only later in the Session. Then-Representative Sam Vincent presented those...those standards about the second week of June...again, with no committee hearing. The...standards were set in place on a noisy day just like this, and they set minimum standards which are cast in bronze. Now they work in a lot of circumstances, but when we try to hard and fast standards into the day to day existence of every family in this state we are, at least in my view, overregulating. Now the standard is to be changed. minimum standard is to be elevated. Instead of coming right out so you can compare apples and apples and determine how much more someone will be asked to pay child support, this Bill sets forth a confusing standard. At the present time you take your gross paycheck, and you subtract certain items which are generally shown on your paycheck stub to get down to the net income which you multiply by the percentage in the formula to determine the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

minimum amount of child support. This Amendment, which was not heard by any House committee in the form of a piece of legislation, provides for a standard which takes your gross paycheck and asks you to determine what your adjusted gross Some of you may know what your adjusted gross income is. income is, and some may not, and those of you who are self-employed are going to find that standards are set forth in this Amendment to govern how you will have to pay child support. Child support Amendments...child support is The Amendment as it now stands contains the increased. provision that the custodial parent's contribution is, definition, exactly equal to that of the noncustodial parent as a minimum whether it is so or not although the Sponsor has indicated that she may be willing to remove that provision later. If you are well-to-do if your income is in excess of \$110,000, then there are no standards. Then you can negotiate whatever child support you wish to be paid. We have, in this state now, every child support payment is a judgment immediately, effectively, not without court hearing, not without a right to...to have a judge say whether there shall be a judgment entered against you or Wham, bam, the child support payment...the day it you pay weekly, every weekly payment Every child support payment is required to be taken from the payors paycheck. Now, I for one, think that child support needs to be monitored very closely. It needs to be fair and equitable. It needs to be set so that it is in the best interest of the children, but if we place intractable standards in the statute books and allow them to become judgments, then in difficult times, and that's where we find ourselves right now, people who are out of work or people who are working for lower wages cannot make their child support payments, and if they are not

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

sophisticated enough to get right into the courtroom to petition for them to be lowered, they will find judgments racking up against them week after week after week which they cannot pay. Who does that help? Does that help the child? No. All of this legislation is presented to us in the guise of increasing Public Aid child support This legislation is designed really and collections. effectively to bear down hard on those who are paying, who have been to court, who have worked out something either in dispute in court or by agreement between spouses, and it seeks to increase the amount of their support against their will and in such a fashion that there's nothing they can do about it, and if they're out of work, they're out of luck. We hear that this will cost us federal dollars if we don't enact something like this, and I say to you, our society has been one which we pride ourselves in taking care individuals on a circumstance by circumstance basis. have courts. We have negotiations. We have had a system that worked reasonably well for a long period of time. If the judges think that child support is not enough, they can increase the payments. We don't need an oppressive statute like this enacted on our books, especially without House committee hearings. I urge defeat of this very, very bad Amendment...oppressive Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she'll yield."

Harris: "Thank you. I'll try to be brief. Representative, if you'd help me out. I'm not that familiar with the issue, and I just have a couple of questions. I'm looking both at the Amendment and at a summary of it. The current situation or the current determination for what income is eliqible for child support: Are income taxes currently

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

deducted from...from that?"

Currie: "Yes, they are."

Harris: "As I understand your Bill, that is...that would no longer be the case. Income taxes would no longer be deductible."

Currie: "We use adjusted gross income and part of the reason for making that change, Representative, is that if an individual makes sure the IRS collects a lot from each weekly or monthly paycheck and is eligible for a substantial refund at the end of the year, the amount of money that is in the net income is a way of sheltering some income against application of child support quidelines."

Harris: "I follow the logic..."

Currie: "That's also why the percentages are different."

Harris: "I follow the logic. My concern, though, is...I suppose that's a way around it, but...a way around paying child support, yet it seems to me that a court would be able to look at the total income...before taxes...current...or to determine that he is not...or the person is not unfairly abusing that privilege, because my concern is, take as an example a person who earns \$50,000. Let's say he's in the \$28,000...or 28% tax bracket. That's \$14,000 worth of income which is now going to be included in the formula which for one child at 18% is a \$2,500 hit. That seems to me to be fairly substantial."

Currie: "Well, as I say, Representative, the effort here was to improve the opportunity for our youngsters to grow up healthy, and it is my understanding that the current guidelines are very low indeed, and that even if these guidelines were adopted, there are...there are only five states who offer children less than these would. It was the...these are not even as high, of course, as our consultant recommended we should go."

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- Harris: "Well, I...I appreciate your directness. This, Ladies and Gentlemen will certainly raise the guidelines substantially. Thank you."
- Currie: "And...and...and in addition, on...on the question of income. It is adjusted gross, but if you look at the Bill you will see that there are other...other deductions, prior support obligations, health, hospitalization, insurance premiums."
- Harris: "Are those new deductions? Are they not there now?"
- Currie: "Some of these are already available. I just wanted you to understand that it's not...it is not...it is not everything that counts because these specific items will be deducted after the AGI, the adjusted gross income is determined."
- Harris: "I...I...again I understand, and I appreciate the directness. It's just Uncle Sam takes a big bite right up front, and if all of a sudden we're saying, 'Well, we can't...we cannot take that bite into consideration,' a person is going to pay a substantial amount more under...it seems to me under this Bill, but, I appreciate it."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are some parts of this

 Amendment that have not yet been pointed out that are worse
 than the points that have already been discussed. Mr.

 Speaker, we have some...some order, please?"
- Speaker Keane: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let's keep the noise level down."
- Wennlund: "Thank...thank you. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very important Amendment which will have a severe impact on your constituents, and I think all Members of the House really ought to know what's in this Amendment. One of the things that has not been discussed so far that makes this Bill even worse than Representative

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Dunn discussed is the fact that the court, under this Bill, can attribute or impute income from such sources as low or non-income producing assets. Let me tell you what that That means that the farmer who's sitting on some means. land that could be developed when he's earning a 3% return on his money could be forced by the court to liquidate his farm and turn it into cash so he can pay more in child Now not only does this Amendment determine child support. support based on the fixed percentage of before tax dollars. Now let's take your average farmer, for instance, who may be paying tax at 28%, the minimum level, on top of that he's got to pay self-employment tax of 14%. So he's paying 42% of his income. This Amendment will fix child support based on the gross income, including the 42% paying to Uncle Sam. So he gets hit twice. It will place an impossible burden...let me give you an example of take the guy who earns \$50,000. He has one child. Under this schedule and this Amendment he will pay \$9,000 a year for a two-month-old or a one-month-old baby. Nine thousand dollars a year under this schedule for one child. Let's take another example...father of three who must pay 32% which hasn't changed...he has to pay 32%, of his income his ex-wife, but now he pays it on before tax income. This makes his payments increase by 25%...25%. Income is defined in this Amendment as before tax dollars. Vour gross...no deductions...except for the limited ones that are set out in the Bill which are meaningless. You ought to take a look at this because you're going to get a lot of heat when you go home if you vote in favor of this Amendment. A father who pays alimony...alimony now...to the wife, he can't deduct it from his income to determine what this percentage is. Think about it, and think about the heat you're going to get when you've got half of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

population at home paying child support, you're going to get a lot of heat if this Amendment becomes the Bill I urge you to give serious consideration to this Amendment. It will have a drastic effect on everyone in your district paying child support. As a matter of fact the more serious part is it says it...that in no instance could a father pay more than 60%. Well, let's take 60%. The quy earns \$100,000 a year. He's self-employed. He's paying 42% off the top to Uncle Sam. You talk about a This boy's not going to eat. Think about the seriousness of the impact that this will have on people in your district on what they're paying, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a Roll Call vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. think we've had a lot more heat than light Amendment. The...just for the record. when we look at studies that tell us how much we spend on children, average family spends 28 or 41 or 38 or 27 or 43% of its income, when there are two children in the family. If will note our guidelines here, we're only talking 27%. researchers and our group said that the standards in this Amendment are the minimum defensible standards, point is to make children whole. We would be happy to work with those who have opposed the Amendment, to try to explain why these are not...not...guidelines that are going to impoverish either a mother or a father, but are meant to insure that there is adequacy for our youngsters. Let remind you, that in this Amendment, as in current law, there is every opportunity for the court to deviate the guidelines when there is a good reason to do so. hopeful that you will join me, join the Department of Public Aid, join the Child Support Advisory Group,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

the...the Task Force on Child Support and the various judges and members of the private bar, who worked with us on presenting this measure to you. So, I urge your support for Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351."

- "A Roll Call has been requested. So, all those in Speaker Keane: favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this...Representative Wennlund? On this issue...Representative Bugielski votes 'no'. Representative Capparelli votes 'no'. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't have an opportunity,

 I know I can't raise a question during the debate but if

 the Sponsor could address the issue of whether this law

 could be used as a substantial change in circumstance..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative, we're on the Roll Call. You're recognized for a vote not for...We're through with the Representative Farley votes 'aye'. Representative Morrow votes 'no'. Representative Santiago votes 'no'. Representative...Munizzi votes 'no'. Representative Weaver votes 'no'. Representative Black votes 'no'. Representative...We have to wait for the...Clerk to catch where did we leave off, Okay, Representative up. Burke...Burke. Representative Phelan votes 'no'. Representative Burke votes 'no'. Have all voted...Representative Sam Wolf votes 'no'. Representative Weller votes 'no'. Representative Steczo votes 'present'. Representative...Obrzut votes 'present'. Representative Turner votes 'aye'. Representative Petka 'no'. Is there else that anyone wishes to change their vote? Representative Deuchler votes 'aye'. Representative Hasara."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Hasara: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Keane: "It's too late to do that. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're in the middle of a Roll Call. We'd...keep it quiet.

Does anyone further wish to change their vote. There being no further, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 42 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Barnes and Currie." Speaker Keane: "Out of the record...Withdraws. Did you want the Bill, Representative Currie, did you want the Bill out of the record or did you want the Amendment withdrawn? Take the Bill out of the record. We will now proceed to the Order of Real Estate Law, Second Reading. On that Order of Business...is House Bill 909, Representative Turner. Estate Law, Second Reading. Out of the record. House Bill 1926, Representative Woolard. Out of the record. Bill 1929, Representative Levin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. That Bill has been moved to Third earlier today. Out of the record. Representative Levin. Representative Levin, did you want to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading?"

Levin: "Can I get leave to run it on Third?"

Speaker Keane: "No."

Levin: "No?"

Speaker Keane: "No, we're just doing Seconds. House Bill 2266,

Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. House Bill 2267, Representative Flowers. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedures. Second Reading of the Bill.

54th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1991
- There area no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. House Bill 2268. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2268, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. House Bill 2270. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2270, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. I'm sorry, go back to 2269. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Real Estate Law, Third Reading. House Bill 136, Representative Hicks. Real Estate Law, Third Reading. It's already been passed? Okay. House Bill 1312, Representative Jones, Shirley Jones. House Bill 2594, Representative White. Representative White, do you want the Bill heard? Out of the record. On the Order of Transportation, Third Reading. House Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich, do want it...out of the record. House Bill Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 597, Representative Kulas. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 18 of the Calendar, House Bill 597, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 597 amends the Illinois Code. It

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

provides that a vehicle may not be driven more than five miles, with an approved set of scales to be weighed, when an officer has reasons to believe the vehicle's overweight. It also provides that a vehicle carrying a load of asphalt or concrete shall not be driven more than two miles. This legislation is proposed by the Midwest Truckers Association. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none...Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand correctly that this says that, 'trucks that are hauling asphalt and trucks that are hauling concrete, if they are suspected to be overweight, cannot be taken more than two miles'? Did I understand your explanation correctly?"

Kulas: "Yes, in the plastic stage, right."

- Hultgren: "I'm sorry, I heard the 'yes', but I didn't hear the
 follow-up comment because of the noise."
- Hultgren: "If they're in the plastic stage where the concrete or asphalt is being mixed, they couldn't be driven more than two miles."
- Hultgren: "Well, in some areas, probably not in your area because you're from the Metro area, but...but in some areas that virtually means that they won't be able to be weighed at all because there's not a scale within two miles for them to be taken to. In my particular home county, for example, my understanding is..."
- Speaker Keane: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Hultgren, excuse me. Can we break up the conversations? Can we break up the conversations? Would the staff please go to the back of the room? Proceed, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "The...question that I was raising with the Sponsor, in...my particular area, I think there's only one scale in the entire county that the State Police use to weigh these

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

trucks. There are more private scales than that, many grain elevators have a scale but the grain elevators don't allow the State Police or the ICC Police to use those scales. So, there's only one scale, I think, that State Police are allowed to use, that means that, at least in that particular situation, and I, obviously, am not acquainted with other areas around the state, but you're saying that...that these trucks that are hauling cement or asphalt will be virtually exempt from the weight regulations. Is that correct or did I misunderstand what you're trying to do?"

- Kulas: "You misunderstood. Actually what...under present law, the present law states that they have to take them to the 'nearest facility'. This would say that that facility...they can't take it more than two miles; because, unfortunately, we've had cases where that asphalt or the cement, just within two hours, dries up on the truck."
- Hultgren: "Well, if...if you can't take it more than two miles and if there's not a scale within 12 miles, then really what you're saying is you can't weigh them. Is that right?"
- Kulas: "No, there are a lot of portable scales, the grain elevator scales we were talking about, that they can take them to and have them weighed there."
- Hultgren: "What if the grain elevator doesn't allow the scales to be used for that purpose?"
- Kulas: "I understand that they have to if the State Police wants...wants to get a truck weighed, that they have to weigh them then."
- Hultgren: "Well, thank you and to the Bill. It would appear to me that...this an attempt to exempt certain trucks from the weight limit requirement. It's true that the Bill as drafted doesn't specifically say that these trucks are

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

exempt, but for all practical purposes, in many areas of the state, probably not in the area represented by the Sponsor because it's a more populous metropolitan area, but in many areas of the state, there simply is not a scale within two miles or four miles or six miles or eight miles or ten miles, that the State Police or the ICC Police can use, and that means that there's a certain class of vehicles, probably some of the most heavily laden vehicles on the highway, which are, for all intents and purposes, being exempted from the weight regulations. If we've got potholes now, I would suggest to you that if we exempt some of the heaviest vehicles on the highway from weight regulations, we're going to have more potholes tomorrow."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I also rise in opposition to this and, as you the State Police are very opposed to this. Bill would create pockets of enforcement. Now the reason we don't want trucks to be overweight is because they're eating up the road. If they know they can travel on certain roads that aren't within a certain distance of a weight scale, that's where they'll be, and they'll absolutely eat those roads up. Right now, the percentage of trucks that are overweight, that are stopped by the police, about 80% of them are overweight, the police can tell by looking at a truck. So, they're not dragging a lot of people out of their way and wasting their time. more often than not will take them in the same direction is already going. If he's going north, he goes the truck five or six miles north to be weighed, and nine times out of ten, or even more than that, he is overweight. The whole purpose of weight scales is to keep our roads in good shape and keep trucks from driving overweight. I urge

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Well, you know, the effect of this is going to be rip of the roads. The Department of State Police is against it. The Department of Transportation is against it. You know, the practical effect will be, we will solve unemployment by putting everybody to work rebuilding the roads we let them tear up. So, as...as well—intentioned as this is and seeking to...maximize convenience to truckers, it still cannot outweigh the detriments and that is to put a very substantial crimp into the enforcement of overweight trucks. I rise in opposition."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Noland."

Noland: "Thank you, may I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker 'Keane: "He indicates he'll yield."

Noland: "Representative, all my road commissioners are writing in opposition to this. Have you worked out any compromise with them or are township officials still opposed to this?"

Kulas: "I'm sorry, with all the noise I didn't quite hear your question, Representative Noland."

Noland: "All of my road commissioners are writing in opposition to this Bill. Are they still in opposition? Have you made any compromise with them or are township officials still opposed?"

Kulas: "I...not to my knowledge. I know the State Police is (sic - are) against the Bill and that's natural, because they're the ones that have been harassing the truck drivers, you know. So...but as far as the township or...the road commissioners, I haven't heard from them."

Noland: "Well, to the Bill: In a downstate district, road commissioners are very worried about this, and I'm afraid all it will do is give us more potholes and crumbling roads. I'm opposed to this Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Speaker Keane: "Representative Stange."

Stange: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I applaud Representative Kulas' Bill here. I don't think the State Police says too much about truck drivers except they stop them every once in a while. The Bill's got alot of good points. For an asphalt truck, a cement truck has only x number of hours before it gets to its location before the total...total shipment is totally ruined. If the State Police wants to stop these truckers today, they have portable scales for their own use. They can use them at the asphalt plant, the concrete plant. It will eliminate this problem. The truckers deserve a right on the road. They pay the themselves, they pay the gas tax, the road tax and every other tax that Illinois has. I would urge my Members on both sides of the aisle to vote on this particular Bill. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, under this Bill, as you have proposed and under current law, do local township road commissioners have the option to issue permits or exemptions during certain times of the year?"

Kulas: "This has nothing to do with exemptions or..."

Ropp: "No, I know it. Well, yes, it does because what you're trying to do is exempt them from being weighed now, if there is a distance between the scales and where..."

Kulas: "No, we're not trying to exempt them to be weighed. We want them to be weighed, but, at the same time, we want them to be taken to a reasonable facility. The present law, the way it is now, they can take them 20-30 miles out of the way, just to harass the truck drivers."

Ropp: "Well, so...I think you're attempting to exempt them from

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

being weighed if the distance is...beyond a certain limit based on this Bill, and, so what I was thinking, I think township and road commissioners now do have some options to issue permits for certain times during the year. Should I speak to the Bill? It seems to me like the intent of the legislation originally was to protect roads, particularly, rural roads, township roads and county roads, and...by making these kind of exemptions, as is being proposed, we're just asking for the detriment of roads to be increased at a more rapid rate, and, certainly, it would seem like we ought not to pass this legislation to see our road repair costs go up, up and up. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black. Representative Black, do you wish to speak on this Bill?"

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, one of the concerns I have about this Bill is, if it should be...signed into law, one of the things I think you're trying to do is to eliminate the delay factor, particularly in rural areas where...where grain trucks being delayed because of going out of the way to a scale...and I can understand that, and I can appreciate that. But if this Bill, the way you have it drafted now, is signed into law, would not we encounter more of a delay because the State Police will simply get on the radio and call for a portable scale and then that truck may be down, I don't know how many hours, depending on where that portable scale's coming from.

Kulas: "That's not the intent of the legislation."

Black: "Okay, thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker,

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my only fear with this

Bill is if we mandate a specific distance, within which an

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

officer can take a suspected overweight truck, then you're going to create pockets of enforcement and obvious routes trucks will know they can travel virtually undetected. Unfortunately, many of those routes are going to be in districts like mine and our roads will pay the price. I...appreciate...I can appreciate what Gentleman's trying to do, but for the reasons I just enumerated, I cannot support his Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Kulas to close."

- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's been a lot of discussion on this Bill. just for one can't understand how the Department Transportation can come up and be against the Bill. First of all, their regulations call for asphalt to be poured between 180 and 240 degrees. In order for that asphalt to be poured at that...degrees, it can't be moved more than So, what are we asking for? We're asking for two miles. fairness. We're asking for business not to be harassed by the state troopers. We're not asking for a free ride, but we're asking...if you want to support the business community, if you want to support the truckers, if you want to make jobs for the State of Illinois then vote for this Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk...Mr. Kulas, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I had more votes in committee than I've got on this Bill on the floor."
- Speaker Keane: "They didn't understand what they were voting for.

 Have all voted who wish? Take the record. With 22 voting
 'aye', 77 voting 'no', and House Bill 597 loses...is lost.

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 47. offered bv Representative Kubik. House Joint Resolution 49, offered by Representative Giglio. House Resolution 543, Hasara. 544, Cowlishaw. 545, Stange. 546, Johnson. Capparelli. 548, Parke. 550, Weller. 552, Johnson. Schakowsky. 554, Keane. 555, Cowlishaw. 556, Mulcahey. 557, Novak. 558, Novak. 559, Novak. 560, Novak. 561, Novak. 562, Novak. 563, Novak. 564, Madigan and 565, McCracken."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we've examined the Resolutions. They are all agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative Leitch."

Speaker Keane: "Committee On Assignments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Death Resolutions."

Speaker Keane: "Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 46, offered by Representative Kubik, with respect to the memory of Richard A. Stern. House Resolution 549, offered by Representative LeFlore, with respect to the memory of Charles Lee. House Resolution 551, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Arnold L. Sivers."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. Allowing perfunctory time for the

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Clerk, Representative Matijevich moves the House stand adjourned 'til 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands Adjourned. The House First Special Session now come to order. The Roll for the...The Attendance Roll for the Regular Session will be utilized as the Roll for the Special Session. Representative Matijevich moves the Special Session now adjourn 'til 9:30 tomorrow...9:35 tomorrow. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the First Special Session is Adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Lou Jones, Chairwoman of the Committee on Reapportionment, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 21, 1991. Reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' House Bills 106, 107, 108, 1354, 1357 and 1360. Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of the following Joint Resolutions, to wit; House Joint Resolution 34 together with the attached Senate Amendment #1, adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed by the Senate as amended May 21st, 1991. Linda Hawker, Secretary'. Message from the Senate by Ms. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform Hawker, Secretary. the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence οf the Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #3, 39, 83, 145, 176, 232, 248, 257, 322, 922, 944, 989, 1001, 1045, 203, 204, 1066, 1074, 1091, 1119, 1168, 1201, 1208, 1209, 1218, 1219, 1243, 1253, 1272, 1283, 1291, 1295, 1296, 1302, 1303, 1311,

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

1314, 1316, 1337, 1347, 1353, 1361, 1363, 1364, 1365, 1372, 1377, 1393, 1409, 1420, 1425, 1427, 1438, 1460, passed the Senate May 21, 1991. Linda Hawker, Secretary'."

Leone: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Clerk Senate Bill #1. offered by Representative Homer, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 173, offered by Representatives Wennlund and Hensel, a Bill for an Act to limit the civil liability of persons involved in...activities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 375, offered by Representative Hicks and Mautino, a Bill for an Act to amend the General Obligation Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 414, offered by Representatives Black, Curran and Noland, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 428. offered by Representative Virginia Frederick, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 535, offered by Representative Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Police Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 567, offered by Representative Virginia Frederick, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 622, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 644, offered by Representative Harris, a for an Act concerning the presence at public universities of armed forces training programs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 707, offered by Representative McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the grants by the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 708, offered by Representative Curran, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Senate Bill 757, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 758, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 759, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. Reading οf the Bill. Senate Bill 760, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 875, offered by Representative Giglio, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 963, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporters Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill #3, offered by Representatives Levin, Balanoff and Turner, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 39, offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act to provide for relief to disaster areas. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 83, offered by Representatives Balanoff, Senate Giglio, Davis and Obrzut, a Bill for an Act in relationship to veterans of the Persian Gulf conflict. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 145, offered by Representatives Farley and McPike, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 203, offered by Representatives Klemm and Parcells, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 204, offered Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 232, offered by Representatives Walsh, Balanoff and

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

Giglio, a Bill for an Act to create the Attorney General's Task Force On Environmental Legal Resources. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 922, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act in relationship to backdoor referenda. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill offered by Representative Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend the Natural Resources Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1119, offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1208, offered Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Airport Authorities Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1253, offered by Representatives Kubik and Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1283, offered. by Representative Sieben, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1295, offered by Representative Daniels and Hultgren, a Bill for an Act to amend the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1296, offered by Representative Parke, a for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to solid wastes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1303, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Explosives Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1311, offered by Representative Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1314, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts herein named. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1316, offered by Representative Noland, a Bill for an Act

54th Legislative Day

May 21, 1991

in relationship to wildlife. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1337, offered by Representative Obrzut, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1361, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Act in relationship to ethanol. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1363, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act in relationship to taxation of gasohol. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1364, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the promotion of gasohol. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1365, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1393, offered by Representative Preston, a Bill for an Act concerning termination of parental rights, adoption and continuing sibling contact. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1420, offered by Representative Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1427, offered by Representative William Peterson, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Low Level Radioactive Waste Management Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1438, offered by Representative Curran, a Bill for Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1460, offered Representative Obrzut, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House will now stand Adjourned tomorrow, May 22nd at the hour of 9:30 a.m."

DOCUMENT NAME REQ STORE GROUP COMMAND DATE COPY WIDTH DEPTH ERROR

T052191 137 0 pj 08/12/92 1 66 78

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/09/03 10:08:38

MAY 21, 1991

HB-0017 SECOND READING	PAGE	193
HB-0136 RECALLED	PAGE	73
HB-0136 THIRD READING	PAGE	75
HB-0163 THIRD READING	PAGE	76
HB-0163 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	77
HB-0214 RECALLED	PAGE	77
HB-0214 THIRD READING	PAGE	77
HB-0243 THIRD READING	PAGE	78
HB-0243 DUT OF RECORD	PAGE	79
HB-0319 RECALLED	PAGE	79
H8-0361 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	100
HB-0373 THIRD READING	PAGE	79
HB-0376 SECOND READING	PAGE	80
HB-0376 THIRD READING	PAGE	80
HB-0378 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-0384 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-0386 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-0388 THIRD READING	PAGE	82
HB-0393 RECALLED	PAGE	82
HB-0393 THIRD READING	PAGE	84
HB-0394 THIRD READING		
HB-0395 RECALLED	PAGE	85
	PAGE	86
HB-0395 THIRD READING	PAGE	86
HB-0472 THIRD READING	PAGE	21
HB-0505 RECALLED	PAGE	87
HB-0505 THIRD READING	PAGE	91
HB-0545 THIRD READING	PAGE	93
HB-0581 RECALLED	PAGE	94
HB-0581 THIRD READING	PAGE	94
HB-0595 SECOND READING	PAGE	21
HB-0597 THIRD READING	PAGE	212
H8-0622 THIRD READING	PAGE	181
HB-0622 POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	193
HB-0624 SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-0629 THIRD READING		
HB-0630 RECALLED	PAGE	96
	PAGE	97
HB-0630 THIRD READING	PAGE	97
HB-0631 RECALLED	PAGE	142
HB-0631 THIRD READING	PAGE	98
HB-0631 THIRD READING	PAGE	143
HB-0631 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	100
HB-0632 THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-0633 THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-0634 RECALLED	PAGE	101
HB-0634 THIRD READING	PAGE	102
HB-0635 THIRD READING	PAGE	102
HB-0636 THIRD READING	PAGE	103
HB-0637 RECALLED	PAGE	139
HB-0637 THIRD READING	PAGE	140
HB-0637 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	104
HB-0638 THIRD READING	PAGE	104
HB-0639 THIRD READING	PAGE	104
HB-0640 RECALLED		
	PAGE	107
HB-0640 THIRD READING	PAGE	107
HB-0641 RECALLED	PAGE	108
HB-0641 THIRD READING	PAGE	109
HB-0641 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	109
HB-0642 THIRD READING	PAGE	109
HB-0643 RECALLED	PAGE	110
HB-0643 THIRD READING	PAGE	110
HB-0644 RECALLED	PAGE	113
HB-0644 THIRD READING	PAGE	113
HB-0645 THIRD READING	PAGE	114
HB-0646 RECALLED	PAGE	115
	_	

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

92/09/03 10:08:38

MAY 21, 1991

HB-0646	THIRD READING	PAGE	116
	RECALLED	PAGE	116
	THIRD READING	PAGE	118
	THIRD READING	PAGE	118
	THIRD READING	PAGE	119
	RECALLED	PAGE	120
HB-0423	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	121
HB-0652	SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	121 122
	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	THIRD READING	PAGE	123
	RECALLED	PAGE	123
	THIRD READING	PAGE	123
HB-0656	RECALLED	PAGE	126
	THIRD READING	PAGE	127
	THIRD READING	PAGE	127
	RECALLED	PAGE	128
	THIRD READING	PAGE	132
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	138
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	145 9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
	RECALLED	PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	152
	RECALLED	PAGE	153
HB-0737	THIRD READING	PAGE	157
HB-0763	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	61
	THIRD READING	PAGE	158
	RECALLED	PAGE	159
	RECALLED	PAGE	165
	THIRD READING OUT OF RECORD	PAGE PAGE	166 159
	SECOND READING	PAGE	194
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	195
	THIRD READING	PAGE	109
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	109
	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
	RECALLED	PAGE	159
	THIRD READING	PAGE	160
	RECALLED	PAGE	166
	THIRD READING SECOND READING	PAGE	168
	RECALLED	PAGE Page	72 169
	RECALLED	PAGE	177
	THIRD READING	PAGE	181
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	169
H8-1117	SECOND READING	PAGE	195
HB-1117	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	195
	RECALLED	PAGE	169
	THIRD READING	PAGE	173
	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	48
	SECOND READING OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	196
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	211 62
	RECALLED	PAGE	75
	RECALLED	PAGE	48
	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
HB-1878	THIRD READING	PAGE	174
HB-1891	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
HB-1917	THIRD READING	PAGE	175
	SECOND READING	PAGE	72
MB 20E0	DECALLED	DACE	C 7

PAGE 57

HB-2050 RECALLED

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003 STATE OF ILLINOIS
87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/03 10:08:38

MAY 21, 1991

HB-2050 THIRD READING	PAGE	57
HB-2050 THIRD READING	PAGE	59
HB-2050 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	58
HB-2078 THIRD READING	PAGE	58
HB-2242 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2244 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2266 SECOND READING	PAGE	211
HB-2267 SECOND READING	PAGE	211
HB-2268 SECOND READING	PAGE	212
HB-2269 SECOND READING	PAGE	212
HB-2270 SECOND READING	PAGE	212
HB-2342 SECOND READING	PAGE	71
HB-2493 SECOND READING	PAGE	195
HB-2503 SECOND READING	PAGE	21
HB-2510 THIRD READING	PAGE	4
SB-0001 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0003 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0039 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0083 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0145 FIRST READING SB-0173 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
	PAGE	222
SB-0203 FIRST READING SB-0204 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	223 223
SB-0204 FIRST READING SB-0232 FIRST READING		
SB-0375 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	224 222
SB-0414 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0414 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0535 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0567 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0622 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0644 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0707 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0708 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0757 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0758 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0759 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0760 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0875 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0922 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-0963 FIRST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0989 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1119 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1208 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1243 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1253 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1283 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1295 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1296 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1303 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1311 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1314 FIRST READING	PAGE	224
SB-1316 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
SB-1337 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
SB-1361 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
SB-1363 FIRST READING SB-1364 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
	PAGE	225
SB-1365 FIRST READING SB-1393 FIRST READING	PAGE	225 225
SB-1420 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	225
SB-1427 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
SB-1438 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
SB-1460 FIRST READING	PAGE	225
HJR-0048 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	220
Jord Medded Lon Dir ENED	1 400	220

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 004

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

92/09/03 10:08:38

MAY 21, 1991

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR LEWIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REP. HARTKE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	46
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	54
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	62
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	66
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	70
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	93
INTRODUCTION - ST. CLAIR COUNTY NOW	PAGE	177
REPRESENTATIVE KEANE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	181
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	220
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	220
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	221
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	221
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	221
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	221
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	221
PERFUNCTORY ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	225