99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Carl Schwartz of Bethany Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Bethany, Illinois. Reverend Schwartz is a guest of Representative Noland. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Reverend Schwartz: "Let us pray. Oh, God, who by Your providence did lead our forefathers to this land of liberty and of freedom. To beseech You ever to guide our state in the way of Your truth and peace. We ask You oh, God, to forgive those sins which also easily beset us. Oh, God, who art the hope of all these of the earth, the God of all flesh, hear our humble intercessions for all races and kindred of people that You'll turn all hearts into Yourself. from our minds hatred, prejudice, and contempt for those who are not of our own race or color, class or creed, and bring us into the bond of peace. Most gracious God, we ask You for the people of this state and nation and especially for this legislative body assembled that You would be pleased to direct them in their decisions. That they will be able to lay aside the differences which they have and seek that which will benefit all the people of this state. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Dunn."

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- Speaker McPike: "No, I just wanted to say, Hello, to you this morning, John."
- Dunn: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you here on time, I don't see you here on time very often."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, it would be difficult to see me here on time from Decatur. Are there any excused absences, Mr. Dunn? Mr. Kubik."
- Kubik: "No excused absences today, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118

 people answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present.

 Committee Reports."
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Committee on Rules has met, and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on October 23, 1991: House Bills 104, 1078, 1352, 1545, and 1960. Senate Bills 250, 708, 841, and 1073. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman. The Committee on Rules has met, and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on October 24, 1991: House Bills 562, 1352, 1852, and 2666. Senate Bills 86, 264, 453, 484, 708, 922, 972, 1042, 1071, 1345, and 1455. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman."
- Speaker McPike: "Page 13 of the Calendar, HJR 79, Representative Homer. The Gentleman has a discharge Motion on HJR 79.

 The question is, 'Shall the Motion be adopted?' Hearing no opposition, the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion is adopted. HJR 79 is discharged from the Executive Committee. Mr. Homer now on the Resolution."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As you will painfully recall last spring, a large part of the reason why we were finally able to get out of here with a balanced budget was as a result of the hospital assessment program that was also applied to nursing homes and to some mental health facilities that would have the medical care

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

providers pay an assessment to the State of Illinois which would then be used to match federal funds through the medicaid reimbursement program. That combined total was approximately \$650 million. A major, major part of budget was as a result of the assessment program. That program was carefully crafted by lawyers and experts provided by the Illinois Hospital Association, as well as members and representatives of Cook County Hospital, Cook County Board, and the various state agencies including the Illinois Department of Public Aid, the Governor's Office and all of the legislative branches. Those rules that were implemented in the hospital assessment plan, were crafted after a careful review of the federal regulations time for eligibility for existed at that medicaid reimbursement. No sooner than we had returned to our districts than signals started coming in from Washington that the assessment programs were in jeopardy. subsequently on September 12 of this year, HCFA adopted a proposed rule that would say, that as of the end of the assessment program that had been calendar year implemented by Illinois and as many as 38 other states would no longer be eligible for federal reimbursement. That means, that if that rule stands, that we will have a gapping \$650 million hole in our budget for the current fiscal year. This is a matter of the gravest importance and urgency. This Resolution, House Joint Resolution 79, urges the Illinois Congressional Delegation forceful action to reverse the rule announced by HCFA so that, at least during the balance of our current fiscal year, which ends on June 30th of '92, that we can count on the assessment program that we adopted in June of 1991. I would hope that we would have unanimous support for the Resolution. It's certainly not a partisan matter.

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

matter in the interest of all the people of the State of Illinois, that we send a loud and clear message to administration in Washington that they ought not to pull the rug out from underneath our precarious budget and that of at least 38 other states who in good faith, relied upon the rules as they existed at the time of the adoption of the assessment program. And to do so in the middle of our fiscal year, to throw our budget in a further state of chaos would be unconscionable. And so let us without dissent, send this loud and clear, urgent message to Federal Government and to our congressional delegation that we would hope that they would place this matter in the highest priority and do whatever is necessary by legislation or legislative pressure to reverse what could be a catastrophic rule that would impact not only budget and all of the taxpayers of our state, but would hurt the health care providers that are most in this revenue that we adopted through House Bill 2010 last spring. I would try to answer questions. Ι understand there is bipartisan support, and I would appreciate your support for House Joint Resolution 79."

- Speaker McPike: "The Motion to adopt the Resolution having no opposition, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Mr. Wennlund, did you wish to speak on this controversial matter."
- Wennlund: "Well, there appears to be some confusion and just to straighten out the confusion, let me just assure Representative Homer and other Members, particularly on this side of the aisle, that we stand in unanimous support of this Resolution. There was some confusion."
- Speaker McPike: "Being no opposition, the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. Now on the following page is House Joint Resolution 81. Representative

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Satterthwaite has a Motion to discharge. Hearing no opposition to the Motion to discharge, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, the Motion carries. The Resolution is now before us and on the Resolution, Representative Satterthwaite."

- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House

 Joint Resolution 81 establishes, under the Department of

 Energy and Natural Resources, a task force that will be
 based essentially at the Illinois State Water Survey
 dealing with issues of global climate change. Ultimately
 what we are doing by this Resolution, is to simply
 designate a recipient agency within the state system that
 will allow us to capture federal monies for these studies.
 I know of no opposition and would ask for your support in
 the passage of House Joint Resolution 81."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing no opposition, the Attendance Roll Call will be used on Motion and the Motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. On page 7 of the Calendar...page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 915, Representative Preston. Page 13 of the Calendar under Motions appears Senate Bill 250. Representative Preston on the Motion. You have heard the Gentleman's Motion to discharge committee. opposition, the Gentleman's Motion...Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This may be one that
 we talked about yesterday, but I need my memory refreshed.
 Would he just tell us basically what his intentions are
 with this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I understand it, this is a Bill that merely puts a cap on malpractice awards and changes the tort system so that it increases filing fees for any personal injury cases

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

that are filed and refuses to allow pain and suffering to be part of any award in any personal injury case. It does no more than that, and I would certainly encourage you to look reasonably on this Motion."

- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Preston wants to take the Bill out of the record. On page 11 of the Calendar, House Bill 1499, Representative Curran. This is a compliance. Mr. Curran."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept the specific recommendations for change recommended by the Governor on House Bill 1499."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. There is no opposition to this. The the House accept the specific guestion is. 'Shall recommendations...' Mr. Clerk, 1499. Thank you. 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1499?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 117 'ayes' and no 'nays', and this Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change, and House Bill 1499 is hereby declared passed. Mr. Curran on House Bill 2085. Mr. Curran."
- Curran: "I move to accept the specific recommendations for change on House Bill 2085."
- Speaker McPike: "Hearing no opposition, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2085?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 118 'ayes' and no 'nays'. This Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted, and the House accepts the Governor's specific

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

recommendations for change in House Bill 2085 and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1838, Mr. Keane. Jim Keane here? Alright, on page 12 under Amendatory Veto Motions under noncompliance is House Bill 12, Representative Stern. Grace Mary Stern, 12. Mr. Mautino, House Bill 673."

Mautino, F.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I move to override the Governor's actions on House Bill 673. House Bill 673 amends the Income Tax Act and eliminates the deduction for enterprise zone corporation dividends effective December 31st, 1991. The purpose of the Bill was designed to close a loophole which exists for the corporations that conduct a substantial part of their business within the enterprise zone that's listed as, basically 95%. The corporations could also form holding companies in order to conform to the 95% rule as established by the Department of The owners of the parent companies may then pay themselves in dividends rather than salaries and these dividends would not be subject to income tax. In the Governor's Amendatory Veto, he basically took the teeth out of this Bill by taking and making it prospective elimination. The...as far as the...I move for the override of House Bill 673."

Speaker McPike: "On the Motion, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion.

I'm one of the hyphenated Sponsors, I believe, of this Bill and what it basically does is change the enterprise zone to keep from having double deductions. This is something our late colleague, Richard Mautino found in the law which was really, in my opinion, a method for people to steal state monies. They weren't illegally stealing them. It was a legal reason to steal. I think we need to change this because it is a blemish upon the enterprise zone law, and I think we should vote this...Amendatory Veto."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In all due respect to the Sponsor, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope you listen to this because we're in a dangerous economic climate today. And what you're doing if you override this Amendatory Veto, you're telling a business who located an enterprise zone and was given certain incentives to locate there, that well, we said it was okay then but now we've changed our mind, and we are going to tax these dividends. I don't think you really want to do that in an era as we've just seen with United Airlines that states are pretty cutthroat in their attempts to attract jobs. Not only are states cutthroat, .but we're even facing competition from south of the border and the rest of Europe. This Bill, if you override the Governor's Veto, is then retrospective. You had a company locate in enterprise zone and you promised them certain exemptions. Now, you're going back and say well, we've changed our mind. We're not going to exempt those dividends paid on your stock anymore. Maybe we made a mistake. Do you really want to do that in a time when the unemployment rate in our state is certainly higher than the national average. don't think you want to make this thing retrospective. All the Governor's Veto did was to make this Bill prospective, so that any business who locates in an enterprise zone after December 31st of this year, is told advance, we will not deduct dividends, we will not let you exempt dividends from the income tax. Why in the world would we want to go back and tell somebody that located there five years ago...ah, well we promised you that but now we've changed our mind. I would say that in this kind of economic climate you don't want to do that. I would suggest in all due respect to the Sponsor that you vote

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

'no' on this and that later he comes back and asks to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. We're not talking about large dollars that will be coming out of the pockets of taxpayers. We're really talking about shareholders in corporations. The shareholders don't even know where the corporations are located. They didn't expect this double deduction. I don't understand why we think its a good idea just to give them a handout which is the state of Representative Richard Mautino discovered law. current this loophole, he put in this Bill, we all supported it. It was good public policy when we voted for it last spring. It is good public policy to override the Veto. The Governor's amendatory changes would make for confusion in the liabilities of individuals who ordinary shareholders of companies that one day locate in an enterprise zone, a new enterprise zone against those who are located in an enterprise zone currently. There is no reason to think that we owe it to people who didn't know they had it, a double deductibility that does not enhance economic investment in enterprise zones across the State of Illinois. The dollars are not large but the Gentleman's Motion certainly makes good sense."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn."

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

The previous speaker is exactly correct. What we are proposing to do with this legislation is to close a loophole. A loophole which was opened unintentionally. Enterprise zones and enterprise zone legislation are designed to provide tax breaks, tax incentives for those businesses located within the boundaries of the enterprise

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

zone which are willing to expand and provide new jobs for those people who are out of work in the area and need The enterprise zone legislation and the tax employment. incentives and tax breaks which follow that legislation were never designed to provide tax breaks for those who receive dividend benefits from corporations who have their principle place of business located within the boundaries of an enterprise zone. So this is very good legislation. Yes, I suppose you could say that we should do this prospectively, but I think most responsible businesses would welcome the opportunity to close this because they know how desperate the financial condition of the State of Illinois is at this time, and they operate responsibly. They want us to operate responsibly. would like us to close this loophole and to do many other things to put our house in order. This is the first the right direction. Please support this legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 85% of the businesses in the State of Illinois are small businesses. Small, close corporations, small partnerships. The close corporations that go into an enterprise zone, you might classify many of them as Ma and Pa Corporations. They are not distant shareholders that live in Europe or in New York City. They are businesses that came to an enterprise zone enticed by the advantages of an enterprise zone. They are small business people. The double deduction certainly is an enticement to help the economy of the State of Illinois, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is purely a tax loophole that was put in the enterprise legislation several years ago. I think it would

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

be wise to the State of Illinois and this Body to close that loophole. When you look at the financial condition of the state, it is only appropriate that we override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on this Motion. And I support the measure."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. With all due respect to the Sponsor, this is a good piece of legislation, but the Amendatory Veto makes it a much more...it's a better piece of legislation. By making it prospective rather than retrospective, it will eliminate confusion that might occur if we make the this retrospective. So there is no...we have no argument with idea of closing the tax loophole. That makes sense. And I think that people on both sides of the aisle agree with that. What we disagree with, and why we support the Governor's Amendatory Veto is because it will eliminate the confusion of making it retrospective. I'm not sure that there's going to be...its going to be very easy to collect those dividends...the tax on those dividends anyway. So what we ought to do is eliminate the confusion, make it simple for corporations. The corporations Representative Regan talked about, the small corporation who don't have a battery of attorneys and accountants and all the rest, make it easy for them to comply with this best way to comply would be to make prospective rather than retrospective. Let's oppose the override and let's support the Amendatory Veto to make this legislation. It was a good idea, I don't disagree with the Sponsor. It's an excellent idea. We ought to eliminate loophole, but let's make it a better piece of the legislation by accepting the Governor's Veto and opposing this Motion. Thank you."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I recall, the explanation that former Representative Mautino gave when he presented this Bill was that the loophole that he was trying to close had to do with the large corporation who established its corporate office in an enterprise zone but perhaps had plants or had offices throughout the State of Illinois or even was a multinational plant. And his concern was the way that the enterprise zone legislation was written, was that if they had their cooperate office in an enterprise zone, that all of their dividends as a result of profits that they earned nationally or internationally, would be exempt from Illinois income taxation. Now obviously when the enterprise zone incentives were put in place a number of years ago, we did not conceive that it would be misused in that form. What he did was recognize that there were businesses that were doing that now and suggested that we have legislation to end that loophole. I think that makes a lot of sense. The Governor's Amendment simply says, well, if you are there now you can go ahead and play that but if you come later, you won't be able to. Well I don't think anybody should play that game. It wasn't the intendment of the enterprise zone incentive legislation that was initially adopted. The original intent was, that if you're in an enterprise zone, you make profits that are directly attributable to activities in that enterprise zone that the dividends of the corporation would be exempt. That made sense. But the way that it was being misused was an abuse, and a loophole; and Representative Mautino identified it, offered the Bill. The Bill passed, went to It was the right Bill and it ought to be the Governor. approved. So the correct vote would be a vote to override the Governor's Veto."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ropp: sometimes wonder when, if you are a businessman, when this the rules so often. To me, when we changes established the enterprise zone a few years ago, it would unwise now to not accept the Governor's amendatory When you tell businesses one thing one year change. then come in and change the rules, that is unfair. The intent is by this Amendatory Veto is to allow the rules to have been played the way they were laid out, and that if this is a decision to make these changes, we make it from today on, not based on past history. I think it's a bad precedence that we're telling business in the State of Illinois. It's certainly going to discourage business from wanting to come to this state when, in fact, we ought to be encouraging them to come so that they know that Illinois' word is good."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Mautino to close."

- Mautino, F.: "The legislation that is before us here originally came about when our family accountant at our business showed this loophole, the loophole that existed. Now we could pay ourselves dividends in lieu of...of salary and that would be exempt from taxes. It makes it legal. It still does not make it right. This Bill...I urge you to override on 673. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 673 pass, the

 Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote
 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Clerk. Have all voted?

 Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. This vote is not about income tax deductions. It's about the State of Illinois keeping its word to corporations, employers in Illinois who have made long term commitments on moving into

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

enterprise zones to retain jobs in Illinois, and what you're doing is, you're telling these corporations the State of Illinois is not going to keep its word. You can go to Indiana or you can go to Michigan and locate your corporations there because we're not going to keep our word. That's what this Bill is all about."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 73 'ayes', and 45 'nos'. And this Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority is adopted, and this Bill is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Page 6 of the Calendar under Total Vetoes. Mr. Kulas on House Bill 50."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 50, which is the Family Medical Leave Act of 1991, a Bill which we passed out of this House three times, and I'll discuss this more in my closing."

Speaker McPike: "On the Motion, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. This idea gets no better with repetition. It is still flawed and represents a sledgehammer approach to something better left in hands of the private sector, collective bargaining and employer, employee relationships. This will in effect discriminate against those who need it most. It will represent an expensive mandate which will prohibit from offering other types of incentives, concessions, opportunities to their employees. absolutely the wrong approach. The Governor should be congratulated for having vetoed it. And we should sustain that Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

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

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

A few minutes ago we took away income deductions from corporations that the State of Illinois made commitments to in order to locate in Illinois in order to provide more jobs for Illinoisans. And now we're going to tell employers how they can hire their employees and under what circumstances and what conditions of employment contract they are going to be. We're slowly taking every step to drive employers out of Illinois, drive jobs out of Illinois by mandating what employers can and cannot do with the employment contracts with their employees. The next thing you know, we're going to tell them exactly how many days off they're going to get, we're going to tell them exactly what they're going to make, we're going to tell them exactly what their job position is going to be and how they're going to do it. We're going to continue to drive jobs out of Illinois. We haven't learned from the lessons of the last few years that saw a downturn in the economy of Illinois, jobs leaving Illinois. Why do you think we've lost two congressional districts? Because jobs have left Illinois, people have left Illinois, and it's going to hurt state government in the long run. 'no' vote is the right vote on this and do away with it once and for all so we don't have to revisit this again."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

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

House Bill 50 is a Bill of compassion. If you vote against this Bill, what you are saying, that if a parent or parents have a child that is ill, you are saying that they cannot take unpaid leave to take care of that child. You are saying that if...if you have a death in the family that they can't take unpaid leave or a sickness within that family. The facts of the matter are that in todays economy

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

we have many single parents who must be employed to care of their family. The facts of the economy are that if there are two parents in a household they both got to work to take care of the needs of the family. So what we are is that there are those emergencies, family emergencies that do occur. When we feel that persons, heads of those households ought to be able to take care and be at those family emergencies. Are you telling me that when a mother's child is sick, when a mother's child is ill and may face death, that that mother cannot be . by her child? Are you telling me that? I can't believe it. I can't believe that corporations don't have that feeling of compassion and responsibility. What are we talking about? We're talking about family needs, I've heard a lot about family ethics and the fact that this or that party is for families. first. Ι believe that this Bill should get everybody's vote. And the fact of the matter is based on polls, this issue has the support of about 80% of Americans. It's why, on a national level the administration doesn't know how to cope with it. When Regan...when President Regan vetoed this Bill and after that President Bush. The fact of the matter is, this is a Bill of compassion that we support. And the fact of the matter is, it is not going to cost the dollars that the opponents say it is. No question about that. Give it a chance to work. It's something we ought to be for, and I urge your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. A former speaker suggested that passage of this kind of Bill would lead to the further economic deterioration of the State of Illinois. I would suggest just the contrary. The seven states that have already authorized family and

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

medical leave policies are not seeing an out of flow of the employer community. I would argue that what they will is an influx of workers, of people who would like to work in an arena where they are guaranteed the opportunity to take necessary time off for family emergencies. I think maybe we can turn the tide in the State of Illinois, if promise our labor force the kind of compassion, the kind of caring programs that means that they're not out of luck when a new baby is born, when a parent-in-law needs care in So I think this is a tool for economic the home. development, not a program that's going to send us further down some slippery slope. And I would also suggest those who think we have no business telling the private market how to operate, remember people said that when it was when we were talking in this country about child labor laws. There was those who argued we shouldn't say children can't be in the cotton fields instead of in the classrooms. I think we were right to say that there should be limits on when children can participate in the work force. And I see no difference in principle between our requirements in that area and our willingness to legislate We talk a good family game, we talk a good game for children. Now it's time to put our votes where our mouths are. Ιf you want to be a family, a children's politician, the right vote on this Motion is a 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield? One time. He won't yield at all?. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker...Representatives of this Body, I guess the a question should be raised. How many businesses in the State of Illinois do not allow certain kinds of medical leave now? A question I think has to also be raised is and responded to that people on the other side of the aisle are

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

saying, those that oppose this are not compassionate, that have no concern for the family or members of their when they become ill. That couldn't be farther from the truth. I think every Member in this chamber has care and compassion for families. The question here is, do you want to continue to mandate certain things on business that in the long and short run could very well put some of those smaller businesses out of business? And let me ask you, what kind of a state is it that you continue to force these mandates on small businesses and put them out of business? Clearly those employees then will be home all year. It seems to me that we need to express the kind of concerns to businesses to allow them to negotiate their concerns and feelings within the system, within compassionate collective bargaining process or within the personnel department, that this Body should not be always attempting to tell them what they ought to do and what they should not do, which ultimately drives up the cost of business, which ultimately then must be passed on to the consumer, and you and I end up paying more for every item we purchase because of that fact. If it is mandated. Ladies and Gentlemen of this Body, we are in fact compassionate. True. Let's let business do what they can do best through that collective bargaining process. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a Cosponsor on this Bill, and I know I'm a Republican and most of the Republicans are up here and they're speaking against this Bill. I became a Cosponsor because I believe in the Bill from my heart. After I became a Cosponsor this year, it turned out that we experienced many tragedies in our family, and one of the Members of our family needed someone at home to take care of her. And my son took the time from his job, his

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

vacation time to spend with his sister. It's too bad that we have to tell some businesses that they should allow a time in the families life when they feel they are needed at home. I have always raised my children to tell them, friends will come and friends will go, but there's nothing like the members of your family. They will always be there for you, and certainly my son was there for my daughter. That's why I believe in House Bill 50. It's from the heart. I think there are times when it is needed. I know many years ago when we passed the flex time legislation there were a lot of people that were against that..."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Excuse me..."

Barnes: "When we went back...and pardon me..."

Speaker McPike: "Would you please give the Lady some courtesy?

The House floor please quite down and give the Lady a little courtesy."

Barnes: "Many years ago when we were passing flex time legislation, we had some of the same arguments that are heard on this floor today. A couple of years later when we went back and looked at the legislation to see if anybody was taking advantage of it, more men were taking advantage of it than women were. I think any time that we can encourage the family to be together at the times when it is needed, it is a better society for all of us to live in, and I think that's why we are elected. To help the family and keep our country strong. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, that we have had a free society and one of the greatest in the world history for a couple hundred years, and I think that we've had private businesses addressing these kinds of emergencies and taking care of employees and making allowances as a matter of

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

This is just another mandate that we impose on...on the private sector which really eliminates their flexibility. But the basic issue here is really the question of how do we help families? The first thing we need to do, is to reduce the tax burden on families to the extent that they have a true choice as to whether both parents have to be in the marketplace. If you reduce the tax burdens, state and federal so that families have a choice, we will see a great shift and there will be a lot less two family people in the marketplace. So what we need to do first, the top priority, is reduce the tax burden, see what the lay of the land is and then address the problem. I think the problem will disappear if we stop forcing families with little kids into the marketplace. I urge that we do not override this Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas to close."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not a partisan issue. We have Republican Sponsors on this Bill. We have Republicans who voted for this Bill, even on the federal level. A former Member of this House one of the most conservative Republicans, Congressman Henry Hyde, has finally realized that leave is something that is here, something that's needed, and something that needs to be passed. Now if we wait for the federal government to do something about this, it's going to be a cold day before anything happens. The State Illinois should join the rest of...the rest of the civilized world who say families are the foundation of society. If we don't care about that foundation, this whole society is going to crumble. Now let's look at the arguments from the other side. There are no costs involved in this legislation. Let's not...let's not try to put a cover on this. It's going to chase away business.

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

doesn't affect the small business person. It exempts the small business person. So it doesn't harm him, helps the people who have a need. The people who need to take time off from their work because of a family emergency without having to worry about losing their job or seniority or anything else. Governor Edgar, in his Veto Message, has changed it a little bit from Governor Thompson who vetoed the Bill twice. Cause Governor Thompson's main objection was that this should be part of the collective bargaining. Well unfortunately, only 40% οf the employees...employees...in the State of Illinois are a collective bargaining agreement. What about the rest of the 60%? Don't their families count? Now the State of Illinois has had a family leave policy for the last four years. Has this policy been abused? No. Has this policy cost the state a lot of money? No. The state has benefited because of the policy that we instituted four vears ago. He talks about putting on a competitive Well, I'll tell you who's put disadvantage. competitive disadvantage. Those businesses, those enlightened businesses who now are offering a family leave plan. They are at a disadvantage with the ones who aren't, with the ones who don't want to do anything about the family leave. So this is another argument that goes down the window. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is unpaid leave. This is something that's good, not only for women but for grandfathers, grandmothers, for kids. It's good for the eleven and one half million people of the State of This is something that should be passed, and it should be passed today, and I would move for the override." Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 50 pass, Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote

'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted?

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. On this Motion there are 77 'ayes' and 35 'nos', and this Motion having received the required Three...Representative McGann votes 'aye'. On this Motion there are 78 'ayes' and 35 'nos', and this Motion having received the required Three—Fifths Majority, the Motion is adopted and House Bill 50 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 274, Representative Trotter."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. would like to move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 274. I would like to say at this time that every dollar spent on prevention today results in a dollar after dollar we don't have to spend tomorrow, correcting failure to act. Our nation's health care system is straightened. The state must set as its first assuring adequate, coordinated and accessible health care for those with the greatest needs, pregnant women and Now if I may just indulge you just one infant children. more time and repeat that. Every dollar spent on prevention today results in dollar after dollar we don't have to spend tomorrow correcting our failure to act. nation's health care system is straightened. The state must set as its first priority assuring coordinated and accessible health care for those with the greatest need, pregnant women and infant children. great words, excuse me, those are great words. Unfortunately, I didn't say them first. Eight months ago, our Governor stood before us in this chamber and said those Two months ago, he vetoed the Bill that would have words. made that...those words come to life. We tried to pass a Bill, House Bill 274, which would have raised the poverty level in which people would have been eligible for prenatal

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

care in this state. Every dollar spent, we save \$3.46 in later years on our children and on the health care for our people. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's hold the Governor to his word. Let's pass House Bill 274 for the people of our state, and I'll answer any questions if there are any."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 274 pass the

Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor

vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all

voted who wish? Mr. Black to explain his vote."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In all due respect to the Sponsor, and it was a very eloquent summation of his Bill, the Governor's Veto isn't intended to be cruel or inhumane. He is simply saying to all of us here on this floor, okay, if you want to do this, then pay for it. Find...find the 5, 6, 7 million dollars and in the out years, more than that, to pay for it. Now, I anybody here, with few exceptions, is going to stand up and say we need a massive tax increase to keep all of our promises and fund all the good ideas that we would like to do. And if you want to sing that song about a dollar we spend today saves two dollars tomorrow, you can go into most districts in this state, try and tell people that who struggling to keep their heads above water that if you just buy a new car today, the economy would be better tomorrow. I don't think they are willing to listen to that now. I would say, it's time to hold the line on our expenditures, no matter how difficult that might We dig ourselves out of our own fiscal hole or we aren't going to be able to help anybody in this state, let alone add new programs. I believe if you search the facts of the issue, you have little choice unless you're going to put your name on a massive tax increase, to sustain the Governor's Veto on this Bill."

- 99th Legislative Day . October 24, 1991
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Trotter."
- Trotter: "Let me explain my vote. This Bill, Sir, is not a multimillion dollar Bill..."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, can you open the record? Can you open the record?"
- Trotter: "This Bill, it will cost the state \$500,000 in the next fiscal year. These are matching funds from the Federal Government. Okay, the dollars that we save here, we're going to spend those millions and millions of dollars in the years to come. This is called preventive medicine. This is the program that our Governor has signed on to. Okay, so unless we're just getting political rhetoric on and on, then I believe that we should go ahead and vote for this Bill right now and move it forward."
- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Representative Rotello votes 'aye'.

 On this Motion there are...Mr. Black we're going to take a slight break to introduce a delegation up here and then I'll get back to you before I make any announcements.

 Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Madigan: "Alright, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to break briefly. And if the Members could be in their chairs and if the staff would retire to the rear of the chamber. The Legislature has been very pleased for several days to host a delegation from the Republic of Lithuania. the people who are standing in the Clerk's well are part of the delegation, and they are all officials in the new government in Lithuania which, of course, is the government that replaced the communist dominated government directed from Moscow. So they have been here for several days. They have been visiting with our Legislators. They have been visiting with our staff. They are particularly interested in the operations of the Illinois Legislature in

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

terms of learning how they might improve the operations of what is called the Supreme Council in Lithuania which is in the nature of a Parliament. And we have with us today the Vice President of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Mr. Ceslovas Stankevicius. Mr. Stankevicius will address us now. He does not speak English but will speak through an interpreter, so if you would please welcome the Vice President of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Ceslovas Stankevicius."

Interpreter: "Mr. Speaker, Honorable Members of the House. We are grateful for you for this opportunity to stand before you in the General Assembly, House of Representatives. I would like to thank you for the support you have expressed through the passage of numerous Resolutions in our favor. And also the support of the people in the various districts that you represent in the State of Illinois. The help that you have provided in Lithuania's struggle for freedom and independence. You have played an important part and made a contribution to the present...regained independent status of the nation of Lithuania, and for that we are very The Lithuanian Republic faces many problems. grateful. And we are looking for support in solving those problems. are looking for help in the removal as quickly as possible, of the dangerous and threatening Soviet armed forces in Lithuania. We also need multileveled support in the establishment of a market economy in developing democracy and our government institutions. This visit that we are able to enjoy through the invitation of your Honorable House Speaker has been very useful us, had the opportunity to take part in numerous we've particular, meetings and discussions. We will be verv pleased to see a delegation of your Body here in Vilnius at a convenient time to you. And we would very much like to

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

continue our contact and cooperation both with Representatives and with the specialists on your staffs. Thank you, very much for your support, your attention for the Lithuanian people and for Lithuania. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "We will now introduce all of the members of the delegation."

Interpreter: "Liudvikas Sabutis, is Secretary of the Supreme Council. Jonas Prapiestis is a Deputy, also the Chairman of the Committee on Legal Systems. Arvydas Lescinskas is a Deputy, and is on the Committee on Economics. Petras Vaitiekunas is a Deputy and serves on the Committee Foreign Affairs. Vladirmiras Jarmolenka is a Deputy and serves on the Committee on Nationalities, Minorities and Medardas Cobotas is the Deputy and is Citizens Rights. Chairman of the Committee on Health and Social Welfare. Juozas Karvelis, Deputy, serves on the Committee for National and Constitutional Foundation. Together with them, Members of the Parliamentary Staff, Arturas Racas, Kastytis Skusenas, and Vytautas Sinkevicius."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giglio in the Chair.

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had made an inquiry of the Chair before the Speaker had some guests to introduce. On the Bill that is still on the board, and I believe, if you'll check, the record was called, the board was locked out, the Gentleman was then allowed to explain his vote and someone changed their vote. Now the rule is very clear on that. The Gentleman in the Chair said, Mr. Clerk take the record. The board was locked out. I would ask the Chair to so rule, and if the Chair cannot or will not so rule then I would ask you to extend me the courtesy to answer the Gentleman's explanation and to also seek a verification."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. Mr. Black, after the record is taken, anyone on the House Floor can change their vote. Is that your objection? This Bill has not been declared passed. Anyone on the House Floor can change their vote any time they wish."
- Black: "My inquiry of the Chair specifically deals with Rule 60, it is not suspendable and it says, after a electrical roll call vote is completely recorded and the record is taken, no Member may change his vote, etc., etc. I believe the record was taken."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, Mr. Black, the Parliamentarian will check the rule but, as you well know, we change our vote on the House Floor all the way up until the Speaker declares the Bill passed. You have changed your vote many times and everyone on the Republican side has changed their vote and everyone over here has changed their vote. The Chair always allows anyone on the House Floor to change their vote until a Bill is passed."
- Black: "And I understand what you're saying, I think perhaps we're not on the same wavelength. I believe that you had indicated that this Bill had failed. That you had taken the record and having received 70 votes..."

Speaker McPike: "No."

Black: "I believe that's where you may have stopped..."

- Speaker McPike: "No. I left the Roll Call, I did not declare the Bill passed. I left the Roll Call open so we could introduce the Lithuanian Delegation. The record is still on the board, this Bill has 71 votes, nothing has been declared. And there were two people seeking to explain their vote when I left the podium."
- Black: "Alright. Then, Mr. Speaker...if the Parliamentarian while he is checking, I would ask you to extend the courtesy then that I would ask for a verified Roll Call and

- 99th Legislative Day October 24, 1991
 that would like to simply...a verification of the affirmative vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes, you had on your light. I had intended to recognize two people to explain their vote, and then I indicated to you that I would get back to you personally before I made any announcements. And the only announcement that I was going to make was that the Bill either passed or failed."
- Black: "I appreciate that, and my vote was on to explain my vote and may I take 30 seconds to do that?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, there were two other people seeking to explain their vote also."
- Black: "Thank you. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman made the remark that we are capturing federal funds and it isn't going to cost us any money. We have already passed out of this House today, under a Democrat sponsorship, HJR 79. And it deals with the same thing, capturing federal money to balance our budget. And it's asking the Health Care Finance Administration to withdraw their rules that says, no, we're not going to give you that money. Now Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Health Care Finance Administration doesn't change their rules you are going to have a half a billion dollar hole in the budget. So, let's not stand up on this floor and say, oh, it isn't going to cost anything, we're just going to capture more federal money. We may not even capture enough money to pay our own providers due to a change in the rule. So, I would again ask that the Veto be upheld, and I appreciate your opportunity to let me ask for a verification of the affirmative roll."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke, to explain his vote."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't know, I was always taught at home that an ounce of prevention is worth

99th Legislative Day

O

- October 24, 1991
- a pound of cure. And in this instance...just a little prevention in prenatal care will certainly save the State of Illinois many, many, many dollars later on down the road. So, I ask for Members to take a look at this again and support this measure."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black, under House Rule 60, it says, 'after an electrical roll call vote is completely recorded.' The Chair has always interpreted this rule to mean that you can change your vote all the way up until it's completely recorded. It is never completely recorded until the Chair declares the Bill passed. Alright, Mr. Black...take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this Motion...Capparelli, 'aye'. On this Motion there are 72 'ayes', and 44 'nos', and Mr. Black has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, read the...poll of those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Deuchler is the only Member who is not voting."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg is up front, and he would like to have leave to be verified. Mr. Black.

 Representative Lou Jones wants leave to be verified.

 Schoenberg and Lou Jones. Mr. Clerk, proceed with the poll of the affirmative."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. Dunn. Deering. DeLeo. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hanniq. Hicks. Jay Hoffman. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McAfee. McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago.

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Walsh. White. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me extend an apology to Representative McPike. Upon checking the transcription, I find that what he said was...is exactly the case. He did not close off the board, and I apologize for my inclination to say that he had. Without further ado, Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "He's in his chair. Representative Black, does
Representative Steczo have leave and Representative Homer
is by the..."

Black: "Absolutely."

Speaker Giglio: "Leave. Okay. And Representative Ann Stepan."

Black: "Absolutely."

Speaker Giglio: "Thank you. Further questions?"

Black: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Farley is in the back of the chamber."

Black: "Representative Walsh?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Walsh. Representative Walsh is trying to get a phone call."

Black: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker, what did you say in regards to Representative Walsh?"

Speaker Giglio: "He's over there talking to some...he's right here in the front..."

Black: "Representative Keane?"

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Jim Keane. Representative Jim Keane. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "He just walked in. Representative Keane is at the well, right here."

Black: "Okay. Thank you, I see him. Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative...does Representative DeLeo have leave to be verified? He's in the corner over there."

Black: "Absolutely. He's always here, I seldom ever call him."

Speaker Giglio: "Who was the next person?"

Black: "I see Representative Mulcahey down front. Representative
Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Satterthwaite is talking to Representative Woolard."

Black: "I see her. Thank you. Representative Flowers?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mary Flowers. Representative Flowers, I think she's here but she is taking care of the baby."

Speaker Giglio: "Is Representative Flowers in the chamber? How is the Lady recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Lady from the Roll Call."

Black: "Representative Burke?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Dan Burke. Representative Burke.

How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Black: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Turner is talking to the Parliamentarian and does Representative John Dunn have leave..."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Black: "I'm sorry, who?"

Speaker Giglio: "He's talking to the..."

Black: "Yes, I see him."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Dunn and Representative Preston asks leave."

Black: "By all means."

Speaker Giglio: "Okay. Representative Black, Representative Mary
Flowers and Representative Burke has returned to the
chamber. Mr. Clerk, restore Representative Burke and
Representative Mary Flowers to the Roll Call."

Black: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Laurino is in the back of the chamber consulting with some attorneys."

Black: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw is in his seat."

Black: "When did he come in. I have nothing further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 72 voting 'yes' and 44 voting 'no'. It's 72 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this having received the Three-Fifths Majority is adopted and this Bill has been passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. (Inaudible tape) Page 12 of the Calendar, Amendatory Vetoes Gubernatorial Noncompliance is House Bill 12, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 12 is that Bill known as the Gender Balance Bill. The Governor Amendatorily Vetoed it in ways that I'm not crazy about but am will to accept, because it is a Bill I care about seeing become the law of the land. Just as a kind of aside, in the Waukegan News Sun, last week I noted that the Governor had removed the male chairman of the, I forgot if it was the Ports Commission or the Airport Commission, on the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

basis of gender balance. It was an all male commission, and even though the Bill had not yet been passed out as vetoed, he was already employing the concept. So I think you can see it is an idea whose time has come. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I...excuse me, the Sponsor is asking us to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto? Correct?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Black: "And before I vote, is there a male Sponsor on this Bill?

Do we have a balanced Bill? Fine. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 12?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open.

Representative McPike in the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 114 'ayes' and 1 'no'. This Motion having received the the required Constitutional Majority and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill in House Bill 12 and is declared passed. Representative Keane, 1838."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto to House Bill 1838."

Speaker McPike: "(Inaudible Tape)"

Keane: "That's correct."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1838?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

The Clerk will take the record. There are 108

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

'aves'...Mulcahev 'ave'. On this Motion there are 1...(Inaudible Tape) Giglio 'present'. Did you change DeJaegher, Mr. Clerk? Mr. DeJaegher, Schakowsky, 'aye'. Any further? On this Motion there 109 'ayes' and no 'nays' and this Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change, and House Bill 1838 is hereby declared passed. House Bill 318, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House override the Governor's Veto of House Bill I think there was some confusion in the Executive The Governor suggests that this Bill would impose new costs on the State of Illinois. I'm holding here a fiscal note from the Department of Children and Family passage of this Bill would cost not one penny Services. more than has already been appropriated by the Legislature signed by the Governor to implement the provisions of The Bill is a result of the settlement House Bill 318. reached between the Department of Children and Family Services and the Legal Assistance Foundation the 'Norman' case. That case had to do with the problem that in the Department of Children and Family Services, families that were separated only because they couldn't afford this months rent were in fact costing us a lot, both in dollars and in the emotional well-being of our children. were separated from their families only because of a lack of housing. In the settlement between the department and the Legal Assistance Foundation, the department now will provide housing to keep families together at less cost the taxpayers and certainly at less cost to children who otherwise would be torn from their natural parents. reason for this Bill is merely to indicate to our state

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

courts to the Juvenile Court which was not a party to the consent decree that there is a new rule abroad that in effect the 'Norman' case is the law of the State Illinois and our concern is that without passage of this Bill we will find that the juvenile courts don't understand the 'Norman' decree, and in the event that a DCFS worker doesn't understand the 'Norman' decree we will not be able to implement the provisions of that settlement as smoothly and efficiently as we would like to do. So, I think the Governor misunderstood the Bill when he vetoed it. certainly misunderstood the cost implications. I would urge you to to support this override, because I think us want to make sure, everyone in this chamber, the children are not taken from their homes and foster care when the only reason to do that is because the family can't afford this months rent. So, I appreciate your support for the override, and I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is indeed an interesting Bill and what we're doing in the consent decree in the case of Norman vs. Suter and perhaps some of my colleagues in the law will illuminate or object to some of the points I'm going to try to make. Not being an attorney, I fail to understand why don't want to give the consent decree as a result of this court case an opportunity to work. Why do we want cloud ignore further the issue and the consent decree...scratch that, we're not ignoring it. But we want to embody this in statute under state law so that we might get conflicting opinions in Juvenile Court versus the consent decree? It just doesn't make any sense to me. The consent decree clearly says, the department shall not

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

remove any child from a parent or continue the removal by another person authorized to take custody under state law because of the living circumstances of the family or lack of provision for the child's subsistence. It further goes say not later than July 1, 1991, defendant shall begin. and that's the department, DCFS shall a cash assistance program for class members operation of that shall provide up to \$800 to a family in any calendar Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, give the consent year. decree an opportunity to work. If in a year or two you find that the descent (sic - consent) decree is not doing what you want it to do, then perhaps come back and put into state statute those items that you think the consent decree did not make clear. I would suggest to you that that is the common sense way to do this rather than to embody in state statute before the ink is hardly dry on the federal case consent decree. Furthermore, the underlying Bill that we are seeking, that the Sponsor is seeking to override has, I think, a serious flaw in that you get two different words when it calls for housing of these people. It says to facilitate adequate housing in one section, and to provide adequate housing in another. I think the consent decree does basically what the Sponsor intends. let the consent decree work. See how it goes in the next year and if then need be, come back and correct state statute in some way shape or form that you may desire. please, give the consent decree an opportunity to work and vote 'no' on the Lady's Motion and uphold the Veto of this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's try to outline what this

Bill is all about. House Bill 318 deals with prohibitions

on juvenile courts from separating children from their

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

families in the case where only poverty is an issue. Now, the consent decree that the previous Representative was alluding to in the 'Norman' case relates only to rules for it relates to these issues, only rules for DCFS. The Juvenile Court was not a party to that lawsuit, DCFS was a party to that lawsuit. Accordingly the Juvenile Court is not bound by that lawsuit. So, when the General Assembly, excuse me. When the court made those rules, those rules do not apply to the Juvenile Court. The consent decree only applies to rules for DCFS. So. let's keep that distinction clear. So to say before this Body that we need time for the consent decree to work, is It's an irrelevancy because it does not irrelevancy. issues revolving around House Bill 318. relate to the House Bill 318 attempts to set rules for the Juvenile Court in these areas. The consent decree in the Norman versus Suter case does not relate to the Juvenile Accordingly there are no rules that quide the Juvenile Court. There is no consent decree that can bind the This Bill is required to deal with this Juvenile Court. problem, and if we do not override the Veto in this situation, no consent decree that's on the books in any court will cover this situation. So, let's keep in the goal of the Bill, which I think we all think is important, and let's understand that there is nothing on books today that binds the Juvenile Court. What we attempt to do in this legislation is to set rules for the Juvenile Court, so that this problem and these goals will , be addressed. Please vote 'aye' on the Motion override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's good for us to understand how we got

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

here. Fundamentally, the Department of Children and Family Services whatever reason. either bureaucratic ineptitude or individual caseworkers simply being overburdened, would from time give in to the to time temptation to split up entire families because families were so poor they didn't have housing. such a stupid thing to do because it cost us a tremendous amount of money. So the Department of Children and Family Services had to be brought kicking and screaming to the court and forced over years to finally agree to do business for the homeless, for the really poor, in a different way. Now the department doesn't want the consent decree to become state law. Now I don't fault the director. She's a good person. She's new on the job. I fault the nameless, faceless bureaucrats who fought for years against having to do the sensible thing, and now that they're forced to by a consent decree, want to fight one more time to have somewhere in the future the latitude to go back to doing things in a stupid way. This Bill doesn't cost the State of Illinois any money. It simply informs juvenile court justices of what they should know in order to carry out the will of the consent decree. Ladies and Gentlemen, it will be a travesty to run certain families through the hardship that this department, through whatever ill-advised reasons, has run these families through this difficulty of splitting up families. We have absolutely got to ratify that consent decree by voting in favor of House Bill 318. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree in almost everything the former speaker Representative Curran said, but I would only go a little bit further. I don't know that I can absolve the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

department or the director of the department or absolve the Members of this General Assembly or absolve the Governor of Illinois, the former Governor, or the present Governor our continuing public policy that works in the worst interest of children, and this Bill is certainly the best example of an attempt to correct something that it is ridiculous that should need correcting by those of who pretend to care about the plight of government children. This Bill, House Bill 318, not only won't cost any money it will save a fortune in money and in human dignity. It will save money because of the unnecessary expense that would otherwise have to go to...to pay for foster parents for maybe more than one foster household, for multiple foster households in the case of multiple children, rather than a much smaller expenditure to keep a family together by...when they would be separated only because they can't afford rent. This is...it is ridiculous for anyone in this chamber to vote against this, and again is all that much more ridiculous that the only advocate we have in the State of Illinois, the disgraceful Children and Family Services, should be working to see that this legislation is defeated. It makes absolutely no sense. we really care about children, if that department arguably cares about children, they should be supporting this override Motion. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this Bill gets the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think the issue is clear. Do we want to settle our hash in federal court or do we want our own state courts to be able

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

to solve the problems that may arise between families and our Department of Children and Family Services. I myself think we're better off solving our problems ourselves rather than turning to the federal courts to tell us what to do. This Bill was drafted by the Department of Children and Family Services. Its only intent is to make sure that we do not litigate forever and forever and forever in federal court about mistakes that may in fact be violations of the 'Norman' consent decree for the kids and for our own integrity as a institution. I urge your 'aye' vote on this override Motion."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 318 pass, the

 Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote
 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted

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

 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion

 there are 75 'ayes' and 42 'nos'. And Mr. Wennlund, are

 you still seeking a verification? The Gentleman is seeking
 a verification. Poll those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Conkling is the only Member who is not voting."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Conkling is not voting. Proceed with a poll of the affirmative."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting affirmative. Balanoff.

 Barnes. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli.

 Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. DeLeo.

 Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi.

 Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. J. Hoffman. Homer.

 Lou Jones."
- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, could we get Mr. Wennlund, Mr. Wennlund. Could we get Monroe Flinn and Bruce Richmond verified? Thank you, alright proceed."
- Clerk Leone: "Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino.

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Martinez. Matijevich.

Mautino. McAfee. McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike.

Morrow. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Obrzut. Persico.

Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan.

Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky.

Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter.

Turner. Walsh. White. Williams. Wojcik. Wolf.

Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Conkling votes 'no'. Representative Wojcik wants to change under pressure from 'aye' to 'no'. Okay, Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Jane Barnes?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jane Barnes. Is right here.

Wennlund: "Representative Kurt Granberg?"

She's here."

Speaker McPike: "He's here. He's right here. Mr. Wennlund, right here. Right here. Senator Leverenz is here too."

Wennlund: "I see that. Representative Farley?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley. Mr. Dunn would like to have leave to be verified John Dunn. And Ms. Flowers would like to have leave to be verified. Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley. Is the Gentleman here? Mr. Farley is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative Hicks?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Farley has...Hicks is here. Mr. Farley has returned. Mr. Clerk, put Farley back on the Roll Call, thank you. Alright, Hicks is here. Proceed."

Wennlund: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Shaw. Representative Shaw. Mr. Shaw here?

Mr. Shaw is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker McPike: "Turner, is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Ronan?"

99th Legislative Day October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ronan is in his chair."

Wennlund: "Representative Bruce Richmond?"

Speaker McPike: "He was verified."

Wennlund: "Oh, I'm sorry. Representative LeFlore."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Curran would like to be verified. Mr.

Curran. There's three of them I can't see. Burke, Curran

and Lang. Now who did you ask?"

Wennlund: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker McPike: "Lou Jones. Representative Lou Jones.

Representative Jones is not here. Remove her from the Roll
Call."

Wennlund: "Representative Jane Barnes?"

Speaker McPike: "No, you've already verified her once."

Wennlund: "I'm sorry. Representative Hoffman. Jay Hoffman?"

Speaker McPike: "Jay Hoffman. Mr. Persico would like to change from 'aye' to 'no'. Alright, we're looking for Mr. Hoffman. Lou Jones has returned. So replace Ms. Jones on

the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker McPike: "Wait, I'm still looking for Mr. Hoffman. Jay

Hoffman. Representative Hoffman here? Here he is, okay.

Hoffman's here. Mr. Wennlund, any further?"

Wennlund: "Representative Monroe Flinn?"

Speaker McPike: "He's verified."

Wennlund: "Representative White?

Speaker McPike: "Jesse White. Representative Jesse White. Mr. White here? He's not here. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Wennlund: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Giglio is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Woolard?"

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Woolard. Mr. Woolard. Larry Woolard.

Representative Woolard is here. He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Schoenberg?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold?"

Speaker McPike: "Brunsvold. He's here."

Wennlund: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "And on this Motion there are 71 'ayes', 45 'nos'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, Motion is adopted and this Bill...House Bill 318 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #1 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago on House Bill 475."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 475. This Bill, what it does, it requires persons employed as assistant regional superintendents of schools to be qualified to administer schools on a certificate issue under the provisions relating to the administrative certificate. Let me state the Governor says that this legislation unnecessary. This is a Bill that was supported and I, fact, got the language from the state board of education. This is a Bill that was agreed. It was voted out of here as an agreed Bill, so I move to override the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 475 pass, the

Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote
'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I know sometimes we get in a hurry, but I would liked to have asked the Gentleman a question. For

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

the life of me, I can't understand why we're overriding this Bill, because I think the Governor said it all. It's unnecessary. He didn't explain this Bill at all. This Bill doesn't do anything. I mean, if we're just going to be in a frenzy here to override everything, that is fine. But from now on, let's explain the Bill and give us an opportunity to explain our opposition to it. I mean this Bill is an absolute zero, it doesn't need to be overridden, and I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this Motion there are 73 'ayes' and 39 'nos', and this Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion is adopted and House Bill 475 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Bill 589. Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 610. Representative Kubik. Jack Kubik. Representative Kubik. Mr. Kubik. The Honorable Kubik. Out of the record. House Bill 614, Representative Walsh. Is Mr. Walsh here? Call the Bill. You want the Bill called? 614, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 614 is the Veterans Nursing Home Bill that allows for a 50% spousal impoverishment clause to be enacted. In other words, we're giving the veterans a spousal impoverishment provision which is now made available to all persons who enter a private nursing facility under a medicare program. So, what we're after here is equality, in essence, for the veteran and not in fact treating the veteran as a second class citizen by not giving him this privilege."

Speaker McPike: "On the Motion, Mr. Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Motion to override. I

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

think one of the things we need to realize here is that we talk about this Bill that the idea is terrific. The problem is, we don't have the money to fund it and the effect is going to be that we're going to in fact, services to our veterans homes because we do not have the dollars available through our budget. So, what's going to happen here is, instead of the waiting list being 50 people it may be a 100 people. We're going to be laying off more staff. The true effect of this according to the Department of Veteran Affairs is \$1 million. One million dollars is going to be cut out of the operating budgets of the homes of the State of Illinois, and let's talk about it in terms the veterans. The veterans groups are opposed to this Bill. The veterans groups like the American ex-prisoners war, the AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, DAV, Jewish War Veterans, Marine Corps League, Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Navy Club, the Paralyzed Veterans the Veterans Assistance Commission, the VFW, Veterans of World War I. They are all opposed to this override. I think at this time, it does not make sense to take money away from the veterans homes, and that's in essence what you're doing. I don't disagree with the idea that we need to put the money as far as the ability...as far as the 50%, we're talking about as far as the exclusion far as the widow, or excuse me, yeah, like the widows and the wives, but this doesn't make any sense at this One of the other things needs to be particular juncture. mentioned, is that the superintendents of the veterans homes, or the administrators in the individual situations do have the ability to be able to waive some of these requirements, and they're doing that on an individual basis. And certainly, we would like to be able to pass this spousal impoverishment rule. I would agree with the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Representative if that ability were there in terms of the dollars but the dollars aren't. I would urge your vote 'no' as far as this override is concerned. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Robert Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Committee last Spring, I think that the true results of this Bill were ever By this legislation, 50% of a resident's understood. income can go to his spouse. That leaves less income for the resident to pay into the facility for his care. Ι told that this legislation will make the income of our veterans homes in Illinois decline by \$1 million. \$1 million less money available to these veterans homes. Where will the homes get...to the money? Current year, if law passes, no place. In the future, in the appropriation process, we in the General Assembly will have to search for this \$1 million, because the veterans homes will be going out of business without that money. I don't know the impetus of this legislation but it certainly isn't for the benefit of the veterans in the homes and the homes themselves. I urge that we vote 'no' on this Motion to override. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Walsh to close."

Walsh: "This is not an Appropriations Bill, and what we're doing here is creating a proper representation. The Bill has been misrepresented correctly, but it has not been represented by me. It's being misrepresented and it's being misunderstood. The Bill is to fill a very important need that we have for the veterans and the point is, is that the veteran is being told in certain instances to actually go to a private facility versus the facility that's being provided by the state in order to receive the benefits that they are not eligible for as veterans. Now, it is only a common sense point, doesn't make any sense at

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

all to have this kind of a facility available as we have in three locations throughout the state with another one being built, if we're not going to use them properly. And what we've done here is we are trying to correct a double standard, and we really have that at this point in time. We're telling people on one hand that we're providing the services and then on the other hand, we're telling them that we're not providing the services. We can't have that kind of system in this state. The veterans are entitled to these benefits, they should have these benefits, and we are not moving money out of anything. The point is, this is not an Appropriations Bill, and I request a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 614 pass, the

Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote
'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote. I don't believe anybody on this side said it was an Appropriations Bill. We said it simply will take a million dollars out of accounts and dollars that now go to give services to veterans, take it of the system. Ladies and Gentlemen, I beseech you. What is sapping the strength and vitality of our state and our nation. It's the credit card mentality that we somehow fallen into the trap of. The largest single expenditure that every taxpayer makes is to pay interest on the hundred, two hundred billion dollar national debt, and now the state can't pay its bills and yet we continue to say, charge it, let our children or our grandchildren pay it. We can't continue this nonsense. It isn't an Appropriations Bill, it just removes money from this revenue stream to provide services for our veterans. I would urge you to reexamine some of your thinking processes

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- on this credit card mentality. A 'no' vote is appropriate, and as a previous speaker said, veterans groups, themselves, oppose this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Walsh."
- Walsh: "I would like to explain my vote. The point is here in relationship to the entire concept, is which pocket are we going to take the money out of? It's there, plain and simple. It's just the idea of which pocket it is coming out of, and we have a definite point in relationship to the fact that we're dealing with sending a person down the street and taking it out of the provision available under the spousal impoverishment clause, under medicare, or are we going to take it out of the other pocket through the Veterans Administration funding for the nursing homes that we have? Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "On this Motion there are 69 'ayes' and 46 'nos'.

 This Motion having failed to receive the required

 Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill
 624, Representative Hicks. Larry Hicks. Mr. Hicks. Here
 he is. You want to call that Bill? No. Out of the record.

 Representative Satterthwaite, House Bill 827."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 827. Governor seems not to understand that this does not appropriate any money in this fiscal year or any future we are seeking to do is to put in a fiscal year. All formula for how the Board of Education will calculate funds that might become available to local school districts, should we be able to fund at a level to cover that complete All we're seeking to do by this legislation is to cost. show that as cost to school districts increase, we would attempt to add to the state's obligation for funding

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

special education personnel. And so, I believe that it is a good precedent, a good policy to set. It is something that we already do in terms of transportation funding for school districts, but we know that those appropriations for those purposes are still limited by whatever we do in the budget process here in the General Assembly and through the Governor's Office. And so, I would simply seek for your support in overriding the Governor's Veto on House Bill 827."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black"

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, if...I guess I'm having a hard time understanding what's going on with this Bill. If you say, in fact, that there is no appropriation now or in the future and knowing your interest in education, does it simply become then something like the Merit Scholarship Bill that we carry on the books, and we build hopes and then never, never fund it, never have any intention of funding it. And if that's the case, then maybe we shouldn't do it at all."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I don't believe that your statement is accurate either about the Merit Scholarship Fund or about this one. We do currently give school districts a reimbursement for the special education personnel that they employ within their school system. However, we do it now by having a dollar amount in the statutes and so, even if we were to have additional money available for this purpose we would need to change that dollar amount to be responsive to the way that we would distribute the money. All we're suggesting is that instead of a specific dollar level, which we can fund or ignore, even now, this would allow for

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

a commitment of a particular percentage of that cost which would, of course, change as the...as time goes on and as salaries for these personnel change, but it is really the appropriation process that is the controlling amount for how we fund that line item. In the case where we might be able to increase that line item, the school district might get more, would get more perhaps under this proposal whereas they might not get more under a specific dollar allocation."

- Black: "Well, I understand all that. I mean, my wife is a special education teacher so I am somewhat familiar with the reimbursement problem. But to the heart of the issue, if you're changing the statutory provision on how they are to be reimbursed as to a percentage rate and saying that, in effect, no appropriation is required but this gives us a target to shoot for, then what's to prevent this from just sitting out there on the books and never, ever being that target dollar amount because of the percentage change you're making, ever being met?"
- Satterthwaite: "There is no more compulsion that we meet this percentage designation than the compulsion to meet the \$8,000 statutory figure now. All this permits is a simplification so that the Legislature doesn't have to come back periodically and adjust that dollar amount that is currently a part of the statutes. When the Board Education establishes its budget request, it would use this as a level of suggesting what the state ought to fund but would controlled completely again it be by the appropriation process."
- Black: "Okay. Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. You know, when I came down here, I thought I had some answers. And I guess I still believe in the process, and I still hope to find

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

answers for some of the vexatious problems that we're faced with. Two years ago I was proud to vote for Senate Bill 95 that said we need to put our pension system on a sound funding basis. Now I am ashamed to stand here and tell you that two years after we passed that, and it was signed into law and all of the hoopla on the press releases, we don't do it. We absolutely have ignored it. We've been here 3 days and we've argued and we've fussed about bills we aren't paying, things we said we would do and we aren't doing. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when are we going to all get together, stop the rhetoric, stop the posturing and let's work together to say, we will do what say we will do, and enough of the chicanery. What we can't do, we will say we can't do. I don't have problems with the underlying Bill. I think it's a good We should be reimbursing at that rate. understood the Sponsor and if I understand this Bill, and I voted for this Bill when it came out of the originally. But the Governor's Veto Message, I think makes it very clear. We aren't going to meet that 26%. We have intention of meeting the 26%. We're telling school districts, yeah, build your budget on that. We're going to try to fund it, when we know we're not going to fund Now, I think it's simply time that we all come together and let's be serious and work on the problems that face us rather than pass legislation that looks good, sounds good, makes for a good press release and then we don't ever do it. Vote to uphold the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 827 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. McAuliffe to explain his vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

The Clerk will take the wish? record. On this Motion are 73 'ayes' and 45 'nos'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority is adopted. Bill 827 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Page 10 of the Appropriations. Page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Ronan, House Bill 376."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto from 21.6 million, which he cut the appropriation to back to the figure agreed to by the General Assembly and the Governor of 28.1 million. I think the legislative history on this matter is very important so that we establish clearly in the record how the General Assembly and Governor's Office negotiates an agreement. When we passed the gas tax here in the State of Illinois 1989, that added 5¢ on the Illinois gas tax. Those dollars were allocated for transportation purposes. Not only for highways and bridges but for transportation purposes. And many members from the Cook County area supported that plan, because they saw relief for the Chicago Transit Authority, the Metro System and the Pace System. The dollars that we originally agreed to back in that plan called for a \$43 million allocation to the RTA to be used for the 3 transit systems. As we come now into 1991, it's a much more difficult budget. We're in a situation where we knew CTA had to take a cut from that original deal, and the CTA agreed through the legislative leaders to go to 28.1 million. The Governor then, after we adjourned, cut that appropriation back \$6.5 million. The facts of life, those go to subsidize rides for school children, senior dollárs citizens and the disabled. They are not used for the bureaucracy, they are used to move people in the City of

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Chicago, suburban Cook County and also aids the Metro and Pace systems out in the ring counties. This is a crucial appropriation. It's a tragedy that we make deals between the General Assembly and the Governor, and we end up having to break those deals inappropriately. This would be a bad public policy for us to move forward because again it becomes very difficult when we have future negotiations to agree on a transportation package that's fair and equitable for the entire state and then to put an unfair burden on a certain geographic area. I move that we override the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen House, particularly downstaters, this is a \$6 1/2 million subsidy for the CTA. Now most of us supported the increase in the cap on pharmaceuticals from the \$600 to the \$800 limit, so we have attempted to do what we can for the people of the city of Chicago. But as tight as the fiscal year 1992 is, we realize that increased spending in one area requires a cutback in the other. We simply do not have the \$6 1/2 million that the CTA says that they need. Now why does the CTA need this money. Well they just gave a whole bunch of their people very large pay raises. If they're in so much trouble that they have to raise the fare rates for the school children and for the senior citizens, why did 132 employees of the CTA receive double digit increases, 28 of them received more than 20% increases, and 14 of them received more than 30% increase in their salary. If the CTA is in that bad of shape, I don't think that their people ought to be getting a 30% increase in their salary. If we have that kind of bucks in the CTA, don't need \$6 1/2 million that we don't have to spend here at the State of Illinois. I would suggest that we

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

'no' on the effort to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Balanoff, excuse me, Speaker Madigan. Mr. Balanoff, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are few Amendatory Vetoes of a paltry \$6 1/2 million that will have a greater impact on peoples lives than the \$6 1/2 million dollars cut from the RTA. This money was for reimbursement for reduced fare programs for our golden Yes, senior citizens, students getting to school, agers. and people with disabilities. If this Amendatory Veto is sustained, the Chicago Transit Authorities, PACE and METRO, will be forced to cut this amount of service or increase fares, a situation none of us will tolerate. And what the origin of this money? My understanding is that it was part of an agreement by both sides of the aisle and both chambers when the gas tax was passed in 1989. We're constantly reminded that all we have here is our word, I would respectfully urge all who were party to the agreement to remember their word and vote 'yes'. the Governor's Veto Message, he tried to confuse the issue and talked about double digit pay increases for top transit officials, already making over \$75,000 annually. certainly, I'm one that does not approve of such increases but the Governor has neglected to tell us that these increases apply to only 12 positions. Twelve positions, and account for only a couple of percent of the \$6.5 million reduction. The Governor travels in a private car with a chauffeur. What does he know or care about the misery of seniors and disabled people out on the cold streets trying to travel by public transportation? It is apparent that he does not care about the despair students who's families are unable to afford bus fare to school. The Governor's ill thought out budget cuts have

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

made life miserable beyond description for the working poor, seniors, disabled, and children of our state. I urge all of us to join in voting to override this Amendatory Veto and restoring the \$6 1/2 million for the sake of senior citizens, students, and the disabled who need it so much. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative...Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion, and for those of you who have forgotten, let me remind you that this Motion is simply in conformance with the budget arrangement that was negotiated among the Governor and the four Legislative Leaders on or about July 18th. So you'll all remember those very arduous negotiations that occurred all through the month of July. And you recall how difficult it was for all of us to come to an agreement that would gain the extra majority support of the Legislature in support of the agreement. This was part of that agreement. One of the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle who just spoke against this Motion, voted for this money as part of the final budget agreement of July. What happened after we left Springfield was that one of the participants of negotiations, the Governor, decided to unilaterally change the agreement after he had forced us into these marathon negotiations through the month of July, always explaining that he wanted to have good faith involvement οf Members of the General Assembly, in particular the Members of the Democratic Party. So, in my view, the acceptance of this Motion, the adoption of this Motion simply returns the budget to the form that was agreed to by the Governor and the four Legislative Leaders and then adopted by vote of the General Assembly, nothing more. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. part of that arrangement and the facts are a little different than the previous speaker recited. On July 30th, the Governor made more than \$20 million in additional budget cuts. Among the cuts were \$6.5 million in subsidies for the Regional Transportation Authority. In the session, the General Assembly negotiated a concluded balanced budget without raising taxes to the credit of our Executive Branch and yes, to the General Assembly as a whole. A balanced budget that the four leaders and agreed to in very great detail. Governor During the negotiations, many decisions had to be made on reducing the states budget and reducing our spending. These were easy decisions, you remember those, because many of you were part of each and every discussion that took ones that were not taken lightly, but ones that needed to be made to restore economic stability to Illinois. Leaders and the Governor agreed to a level of funding four the circuit breaker program that provides for pharmaceutical assistance to senior citizens. That was an integral part of our agreement, agreed to specifically by the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House and the Governor of the State of agreement that we said we would bring to the General Assembly and ask our Members to approve, and several times we went back to our caucuses and back into the meetings to discuss in specific detail the pharmaceutical cap and the issues that were brought up there. This Assembly then, through the Majority Party, sent the Governor a budget that exceeded the agreed level and the negotiated terms of agreement by more than \$6 million causing the budget to be

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

out of balance and specifically violated the agreement on the pharmaceutical assistance cap by starting that action in the Senate and then when it came back here and a concurrence by the Majority Party violated the part of that The Governor, instead of cutting funding for senior citizen program to the agreed level. decided balance the budget by cutting the funding to the CTA. I believe when you take everything into consideration, the Governor made the right decision. I believe the taxpayers of Illinois expect us, the individuals they elect to represent them, to live within its means and balance the state's budget. At a time when the taxpayers are hearing from Washington about bounced checks, free lunches and pay raises, we in the Illinois General Assembly must take tough decisions to restore fiscal stability to the state's Illinois must have a balanced budget. The taxpayers expect that from us. Governor Edgar has made the tough decisions and made one that had to be done and one that I agree with. As far as the action of looking at the CTA subsidy he recognized, since there was a movement in the Senate by the Democratic Leadership and that violated the agreement, that it had to come from somewhere the rest of the state and the and why punish citizens of this state in cutting out that pharmaceutical assistance cap. So, let me say to you, to specifically, if you vote to restore these funds you are voting against your interests downstate, you're voting against the senior citizens, you're voting against the pharmaceutical cap that the Governor negotiated, yes, with the four leaders and then when the item was changed contrary to his agreement, then had to find that money elsewhere. I ask you to sustain the Governor's actions and in particularly those of you from downstate, don't be sold

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

a bill of goods or lulled into security by voting to restore funding for one sector of this state, in the northern part, and ignoring your responsibilities to downstate Illinois. Vote to sustain the Governor's action."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ronan to close. Why don't you explain your vote. Is that alright? We're trying to, time is moving here. Mr. Ronan to close."

Ronan: "Very briefly, let the facts speak for themselves. When we passed the gas tax increase, we generated a quarter of a billion dollars in new money for transportation projects. An agreement came out of that gas tax to send a certain proportion to the RTA region to help mass transit. worry about roads, we worry about bridges, we've got worry about buses, and we have to worry about trains. million dollars was agreed to by the leaders and this...you know, talking about pay raises, there are pay raises state government, there's pay raises in federal government, there's pay raises in the General Assembly. Of course some pay raises. CTA people got a few So did some top executives in state government. That's a red herring makes no sense. These dollars are going to school kids so they can get to school, they're going to seniors so they can go shopping and go get their pharmaceuticals, they're going to the disabled so they have an opportunity to utilize a transportation network in the northeast This is \$6 million and its a principle, of this state. because if you can't make a deal then there is no reason should be here. I urge every Member to vote 'ave'."

Speaker McPike: "On page 10 of the Calendar under House Bill 376,

Motion #1. The question is, 'Shall this item be restored
to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of

99th Legislative Day October 24, 1991
the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.
Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I mean, I just can't believe that the facts are that the CTA gave embarrassing raises, embarrassing raises their people, and now they are expecting by virtue of smoke and mirrors to tell you that senior citizens and students have to pay for these raises. That's what the bottom line is here, and they're going to try to take it out of the backs of METRO and PACE if this doesn't succeed. I am telling you that this Body has already voted this week alone, to spend \$29 million, more money of the taxpayers money than we have. Were is that going to come from? Now we want this money to be spent. I do not understand this. We continue to override the Governor's Veto with money we don't have, and now you want to blame it on some kind of a deal. This makes sense, this is logical to sustain the Governor's Veto. The taxpayers of state expect this Governor to make these kind of votes and this Body to sustain it. When election time comes around, the citizens ought to pay attention to the people that are voting to bust the budget of this state. That's what Democratic Majority in this House has done all week, to bust the budget of this state."

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

Stange: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The CTA definitely needs a shake—up now. They haven't improved service one iota. They want to cut security, but we have plenty of chauffeurs to drive the brass around. There's contracts from a lot of the Legislators in this room with the CTA. We have to look at that. Possibly maybe we should have the private sector take over the CTA. We haven't had any improvement on the

99th Legislative Day-

October 24, 1991

CTA in years. This is a terrible, terrible 'yes' vote. We have to sustain the Veto. I definitely recommend a 'no' vote on this...on this House Bill 376."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn, one minute."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard a lot about deals and negotiations between the Executive Branch and the Rank and file members Legislative Leaders. involved with those deals, and there was a lot of other people that weren't involved with those deals. public, a lot of them did make deals with the State of Illinois to provide nursing home services and to provide pharmaceuticals to people on medicaid, and we disregarded those deals and refused to pay those Today we stand here talking about restoring money for the CTA without taking care of nursing homes and pharmacies, without taking care of the \$800 million budget shortfall that we have as of this moment and ignoring at the time the growing deficit in the State of Illinois. We should turn this Bill down. We should face our problems. We should decide what we're going to do overall about the budget, and we should honor the contracts we have made with these providers who are going broke by the hour, the day and the minute. This is a terrible thing to do." Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just so that there's no misunderstanding by the Members of this House, these dollars are not gas tax dollars. They are general revenue fund dollars that subsidize the CTA. So, we're not talking about taking away gas tax dollars that motorists in Illinois are paying for. So, that that's clarified and that the proper vote is a vote to sustain the Governor's Veto, and in the event that this gets the required number of votes, I request a

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

verification."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before...an inquiry of the Chair. How many affirmative votes does this take to restore the Reduction Veto?"

Speaker McPike: "60."

Black: "Only 60 votes?

Speaker McPike: "Only 60."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To my downstate colleagues, listen to me very carefully. To my downstate colleagues, many of us represent rural areas where mass transit is a..."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed. Turn on Mr. Black, again."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To my downstate colleagues where in rural areas mass transit is often a new pair of shoes, I would like to read some figures to you. As result of the 1989 gas tax increase the five year plan, the five year plan that has been adopted and published, listen to these figures. For FY90 to FY94, the Chicago area has received or will receive approximately \$878 million through the mass transit program. Downstate has received in that same five year plan or will receive approximately \$23 million from the mass transit program. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you do this now, I'll guarantee you they're going to be back next year because there fiscal year ends in two months. They will be back. I urge you to sustain this Reduction Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Weller, for what reason do you rise? You spoke in debate."

Weller: "I was going...no, I did not speak in debate, Mr. Speaker. I rose to explain my vote."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Oh, I thought you spoke in debate, so, that's my error. The record has been taken. There are 60 votes, and Mr. Wennlund asks for a verification. On this Motion there are 60 'ayes' and 58 'nos'. Representative Wennlund has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Brunsvold. Buqielski. Burke. Capparelli. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Farley. Giglio. Giorgi. Hannig. Flinn. Flowers. Hartke. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Matijevich, McAfee, McGann, McGuire, McNamara, McPike, Morrow. Mulcahev. Munizzi. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Rice. Preston. Richmond. Ronan. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. White. Williams. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Keane is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker McPike: "Mulcahey is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Homer?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Phelps?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Wolf?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker McPike: "Charles Morrow. He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Williams?"

99th Legislative Day October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Paul Williams. He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Stern?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Hartke?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker McPike: "He's voting 'no'."

Wennlund: "Representative Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here."
Wennlund: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "On the Motion there are 60 'ayes' and 58 'nos', and this Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores the line item and House Bill 376 having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 708, Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 708 takes the situation last year in Senate Bill 45 which forced the school districts to receive their payment one month late."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran, the Chair had to go to the Motion first. The correct order of business was to go to the Motion. So on page 13 of the Calendar is a Motion on Senate Bill 708. Mr. Curran moves to suspend Rule 79(e) and place it on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. The...Senate Bill 250 is now on the Order of Conference Committee Reports and we return to page two of the Calendar under the Motion. Page two of the Calendar, Senate Bill 708, Mr. Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since 1975, the state has made a general double...general state aid payments to schools in

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

June and no payments in July. State law required two GSA payments per month on the 10th and 20th of each month from August through May and then double payments on the 10th and 20th of June. The double payments which were received in June were a delay of the previous July's payment, advance of the next months payment. So when we did what we did last year, we were in fact, and we did it on a permanent basis, we were in fact permanently depriving states school aid payments of about \$176 million. We broke faith with the school children of our state for ... by the tune of \$176 million. By the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 708, we make that arrangement last year only temporary, and what we do is that we will change back that payment making it double again in the month of year 1994. In addition, what this Conference fiscal Committee Report does is that in the intervening fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993...I'm sorry fiscal of year 1993, what we do is we allow interest payments for the schools to borrow that money for one month. So what we are doing in effect is we are making it right for the schools in the short term by taking care of their interest payments so they don't have to borrow the money for a month and pay the interest that we should be paying, and then we're making that up on a permanent basis in fiscal year glad to answer any questions. I believe that this Bill will make it fair for the school children of Illinois and for the school districts of Illinois."

Speaker McPike: "A Member has pointed out to the Chair, stated that Senate Bill 250 was in front of us. The correct Motion was on Senate Bill 708. So the Chair's earlier remarks referred to Senate Bill 708 where the Rules were suspended, and it was placed on the Order of Conference Committee Reports by the Attendance Roll Call, and now we

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

have returned to 708 on page two, and Mr. Curran has moved for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report. And there being no question, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 708?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Wennlund."

- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

 Speaker McPike: "I didn't see your light on before I called for that. But go on and proceed."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative Curran, the effect of this Conference Committee Report, does this Conference Committee Report effectively eliminate the balance of the budget by shifting the second payment in June into the next fiscal year?"
- Curran: "This Bill doesn't really affect the state budget,
 Representative. It affects cash flow. What we were doing
 is we were...we were paying out of next years money last
 years bill. So we're not really affecting the budget at
 all but we are affecting the flow of cash in the future
 year, fiscal year 1994."
- Wennlund: "But wasn't there \$176 million in payments that would have had to have been paid in the month of June of 1991 that was shifted into fiscal year '92 in order to balance the budget with that \$176 million?"
- Curran: "It is a cash flow savings. It doesn't...what we did by Senate Bill 45 is affect fiscal year 1992 not 1991."
- Wennlund: "So how does this affect the shifting of that \$176 million then in June of 1992 into the next fiscal year '93 after June 30th of '93?"
- Curran: "This Bill doesn't affect that at all. It affects fiscal year 1994. It says that there should be double payments in June in that fiscal year and thereafter."
- Wennlund: "Will this require double payments in June of 1992?"

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

- Curran: "No. This does not...this does not speak to the question of that year. This leaves intact the understanding of Senate Bill 45 last year and attempts to correct that problem in fiscal year 1994."
- Wennlund: "What's the problem it's attempting to correct, I guess is the bottom line?"
- Curran: "The problem we're attempting to correct, is its school aid payments that the school...that schools of the State of Illinois to the general state aid program really were deprived of \$176 million. All that hue and cry was in fact accurate. It was in fact accurate, because when we...when we took that double June payment and made it into the following month, we were breaking faith with the school systems of the State of Illinois, because we had previously, when we started all of this, borrowed from the earlier July...put the money from the earlier July in a double aid payment in the month of June in 1975."
- Wennlund: "So what you're doing is you're obligating the state to pay interest for FY '92 and FY '93, and then in FY '94, we're going to have to come up with another magic \$180 million to make that payment?"
- Curran: "Somebody is going to have to come up with it. Either the children of the State of Illinois, the schools of the State of Illinois come up with it, or we fess up to our responsibility and we stop playing the shell game with money. Somebody has to come up with it. I say it should be us. Stop playing the shell game rather than forcing the schools and our children to come up with it."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. Thank you for answering my questions.

 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're doing here is

 we're committing this General Assembly or committing the

 State of Illinois out in 1994 to come up with another \$180

 million in order to meet that payment. In addition to

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

that, we're committing the State of Illinois to pay heavy interest for all of 1992 and 1993 when in effect what really happened under Senate Bill 45, all it did is push it into another fiscal year. This is irresponsible budgeting. It's irresponsible commitments that are being made to school districts when we don't know we can provide the other \$180 million in '94. This Bill ought to be delayed until 1994 when we see what the budget looks like then. It may be worse than it is this year. It's totally fiscal...fiscally irresponsible, and it's not an action this General Assembly should take. And this Conference Committee Report should be defeated."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, I have a lot of people that want to explain their votes. So there are going to be one minute explanations. Representative Homer."

I think this a Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. imminently reasonable thing to do in light of the fact that when we voted on Senate Bill 45 very few if any of us here were aware that by helping to solve our budget problem by deferring a pay the...the final school aid payment in FY '92 into the next fiscal year that although that did balance our budget, it threw school budgets out of balance. Schools that had already adopted their budget on the cash basis that are on the same fiscal year that we are, which is practically all of the downstate school districts, found that when we went home we had given them the permanent extension, the surtax, but had taken away almost the exact amount from their budget by this gimmick of postponing the payment to them. This Bill says that yes, they're going to have to suffer like all of us and everyone else through the next two years but that at a point certain, FY '94 that we're going to make it right with them by putting that money back into their..."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Hartke, one minute to explain your vote."

Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I read this piece of legislation in the Conference Committee Report, I see nowhere where it commits the State of Illinois to any dollars. It's talking about payments, and it puts permanency in a date, time certain, when we will make that final payment to the school board. And I urge support of this legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig, one minute to explain your vote."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. And I, too, rise in support of this proposal. Because we changed or delayed the state aid payment from June to July, the net effect for our budget year this year is will be making eleven payments to schools this year. Next year we will be making twelve and this Bill proposes fiscal year 1994 that we catch up by simply making 13 payments. So the net effect of this Bill is that we will pay the schools interest on the money that we postponed for thirty days, that we'll make this procedure temporary and that we will get back on the same track that we've always been on in 1994. I think it's fair that we should do this to the schools. As Representative Curran so aptly said, by not doing so, we've broken faith with our schools. change that we made earlier in the year will help our cash flow situation, but to the detriment of our schools. And I think that by passing this today..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder, one minute to explain your vote."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. How many votes does it take..."

Speaker McPike: "Seventy-one, seventy-one votes."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let us be clear here what it is that we're talking about. This Bill is full of sound and

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

fury, but it doesn't really signify anything. It's a promise that we'll keep maybe sometime in the future. Well let me explain to you as of right now, that in the calendar year of 1991 school districts will receive twelve payments. In the calendar year of 1992 school districts will receive 12 payments. They get the same amount from January to December in each year. It's because of the way they slice the year for their fiscal purposes that they don't get the money in June but rather in July. The same thing happens if you're a little bit slow collecting your real estate taxes, you don't get that money. It's a bookkeeping problem not..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ropp, one minute to explain you vote."

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ropp: "Thank you, Unfortunately, there is a perception out there on behalf of school administrators and people who are involved in school boards that the state is not attempting to live up to their intent. I don't believe this Legislature in anyway when we passed the previous legislation said that we are not going to give the full \$176 million to schools. That is not the intent, but the perception out there is that we will not fund it. I'm voting for this at this particular time, because I want to give those people involved administration of our educational systems the understanding that, yes, we do intend to fund it and will fund it. Unfortunately, come three or four years from now this Bill does not give any quarantee that our fiscal situation going to be any better than it is today. I don't want to give them any false hopes, but I do want to assure them that we will continue to fund them at the rate that we have for the past several years."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must have misunderstood

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

something you said earlier today. I thought while we were explaining our votes the board is open. And I...Mr. Speaker, I was addressing this to you. I thought while we were explaining our vote the board is open and the board is already closed. I wanted to hear other peoples comments before voting, and now I am unable to vote. I wonder if I could be recorded as 'present' please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, that was my error. You can change your vote."

Parcells: "I'd like to make it 'present' please, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Record Mrs. Parcells as 'present'.

Okay, the Chair closed the board in error. Ms. Wojcik
wants to be recorded as 'present'. And Representative
Pullen wants to vote from 'present' to 'no'. Mr. Black,
one minute to explain your vote."

Black: "No, no. Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "This Bill...this Conference Committee Report has an immediate effective date, and you have already ruled that it takes seventy—one votes?"

Speaker McPike: "It takes seventy-one votes."

Black: "Okay, is it my understanding the board is open if we want....you said you were in error about locking out the board."

Speaker McPike: "I closed the board in error, yes."

Black: "Okay, so the board is open now."

Speaker McPike: "No, I can't open it, but if you want to change your vote I can change your vote. The Clerk can change your vote."

Black: "Let me continue then with some inquiries of the Chair according to the Rules? When did you suspend Rule 79(e)?

I thought you suspended that on Senate Bill 250."

Speaker McPike: "No, then if you'll check the record I read in

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

there that, that I was in error when I said Senate Bill 250. I said, I was referring to Senate Bill 708, and I said that the Attendance Roll Call would be used on 708 to suspend Rule 79(e). And I'm sure the record will reflect that "

Black: "You mean I have to check the record again?"

Speaker McPike: "I think so."

Black: "Alright, let me ask you another question. Let's assume that 79(e) was in fact suspended in the appropriate fashion?"

Speaker McPike: "Okay."

Black: "Does that...an inquiry of the Chair and the Parliamentarian. Does that automatically mean that subsection a, b, c, and d are suspended as well?"

Speaker McPike: "No, 79(e) was the only thing suspended."

Black: "Alright, then my inquiry of the Chair is, I would ask the Chair to rule under 79(d) that at all other times Conference Committee Reports must be on our desks for one day before we act on it. I don't believe this has been on our desks for one day."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, it's been on...it's been here for one day,

Mr. Black."

Black: "I'm sorry, wait a minute. What? This has been on our...reproduced distributed on the Member's desks and listed in the daily or Supplemental Calendar at all other times for one day. You're telling me this has been on our desks for one day?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Oh, I...I would ask the Parliamentarian to reexamine that. I don't think it has been."

Speaker McPike: "Well it has."

Black: "Not having enough votes to ask a challenge to overrule the Chair, I quess there's not much else I can do. But if

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

that's your ruling then so be it."

Speaker McPike: "Okay, thank you. The record has been taken.

Does anyone else wish to change their vote? Mr. McCracken would like to change from 'no' to 'present'. Mr. Ryder would like to change from 'present' to 'no'. Mr. Ryder from 'present' to 'no'. On this Motion there are 84...What is it, Mr. Dunn?"

Dunn: "I indicated that I wanted to explain my vote. Do I have that right?"

Speaker McPike: "Yeah, go ahead."

"Thank you. Where I come from, the...especially the school Dunn: be very happy about this not superintendents will legislation. They're going to remind everyone who voted for this, that Chicago will get its payment next Spring because it has a different fiscal year, a fact we were not told about last July when this concoction was made. legislation is not going to appease the school superintendents who are upset. They will say that 1994 is so far out into the future that we don't know what will And secondly, of course, it does nothing for the pharmaceutical and the nursing home providers who are left out in the cold again when another Bill comes down the legislative pipeline, the assembly pipeline and so ...this policy. We should not pass this Bill at this is poor time."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels, one minute to explain your vote. Mr. Daniels please."

Daniels: "In explaining my vote, I kind of hoped that Representative Dunn hadn't been so perceptive and explain why we said on the CTA override that you downstaters were making a mistake cause you cut a deal on that time for this Bill. Now you've been told why you're making a mistake. So you downstaters on this Bill, you're making a tremendous

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

mistake but, Representative Dunn as usual is very perceptive. He's told you what your problem is, you'll see and hear about it again."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund, one minute to explain your vote."
Wennlund: "In speaking on the issue, I failed to vote my switch."
Speaker McPike: "Okay, Mr. Wennlund would like to vote 'no'. Mr.
Olson."

Olson, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm reminded of a cartoon I've seen on one of those Saturday morning children shows, where an older Gentleman was walking down the sidewalk and you could see that times weren't to good for him. Low and behold there on the sidewalk in having problems. front of him was a \$10 bill. He thought happy days are As he stooped over to pick the \$10 bill up, here again. some little kids on the other side of the board fence pulled the string and pulled the \$10 bill out his reach. Ladies and Gentlemen this legislation making promises for a change in the funding process in 1994 fiscal year...we don't have a little string on the money, we've got a hawser, a rope on that money and this is false, irresponsible prediction of an almost impossible thing to come in the future. I urge..."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, Mr. Clerk, the record has been taken.

On this Motion there are 84 'ayes', 6 'nos'. Is anyone seeking to change their vote? On this Motion there are 84 'ayes' and 6 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 708, and this Bill having received a Three—Fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino on House Bill 1149."

Mautino, F.: "I move to override the Total Veto of House Bill

1149. This has to do with the licensing of environmental
health practitioners and some points that had been

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

addressed to this. The Amendment itself is going to require the licensing οf the environmental health practitioner. Basically, this Bill is the...it's in the lines with the Sanitarium Act which was repealed in The Illinois Municipal League's opposition to this Bill had been addressed earlier. This opposition was addressed in Senate Amendment #2. offered by Senator Jones. The Bill was considered...it was not considered on its own merits and is lumped together with other Bills. There is a need to regulate the sanitarium's environmental health practitioners, greater today that it was in 1981 when there were over a thousand sanitariums registered. legislation is supported by the Illinois Public Health Association, Illinois Environmental Health Association, 46 other states require the registration of environmental health practitioners. Illinois is the 5th industrial state and this Bill should stand on its own merits which were not addressed singularly in the Veto message. It was lump summed into that, and as far as fiscally, it is...there's a \$100 non-refundable application fee and a reasonable projection of the number οf registrations...does not require the...this also would not require any additional test development costs. And these have been built into the original fiscal note. I think the State of Illinois should have environmental health practitioners to provide safe service to the people of Illinois, and I would urge your support in overriding House Bill 1149."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First, I have an inquiry of the Chair. Just so we're all on the same wavelength. How many times can you move to override a Total Veto? Any number or 2 or 3..."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "No, until it becomes dilatory."

Black: "Ah, we're getting close. Alright, and I assume that the Gentleman has filed a second Motion, Mr. Clerk, is that in the packet?"

Speaker McPike: "It's on the Calendar."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Sponsor of the Bill. Representative, can you tell me what an environmental health practitioner is?"

Mautino, F.: "Yes. These are the people who will go into the restaurants and into the establishments and do the testing to make sure that these places conform to the codes and provide a safe, clean operation for the people of the State of Illinois. They also deal with the wells and water, milk and food sanitation, and also domestic solid waste disposal."

I appreciate that and that's exactly Black: "Okav. thought they did as well, and we have 2 or 3 of those in my home county in my district, and I think they do an excellent job. But all of them that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, work for an agency of government. In fact, the 2 or 3 that I'm aware of, I believe work for county health departments or health departments. So, you know, we had this yesterday. We had this Motion yesterday, it got 65 votes. know what's changed. We deregulated this profession 10 years ago, now we're back going to regulate them, and as somebody said yesterday, well the world is more complicated. Well it certainly is, and it's more expensive. And it's more expensive, because we continually want to regulate license and otherwise do whatever it is that governments do so well and so mysteriously and that's to spend taxpayers money. I say to you what I said yesterday, if all of these regulatory Acts are overridden,

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

the start up cost alone are \$750,000 which we didn't budget for. We have already laid off 22 people in the Department of Professional Regulation. Now at some point we're going to have to be honest with the department, honest with those people in this profession and honest with ourselves. We don't have the money to implement this new Act. We no longer have the staff in the department to enforce this new Act. You, in your good sense and conscience yesterday, did not override the Governor's Veto. I would tell you that nothing has changed, and I urge you to vote 'no' on this very same matter today."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino to close."

- Mautino, F.: "Alright. Since the deregulation there have been, lets see, this has been endorsed as I said, by the Sun Times. They ran an article showing the amounts of and the increases in food—born diseases, salmonella cases. This very Body in 1985 had their own Committee Report which under the recommendation #9, recommended to reinstate the Sanitarium Act. There is a need, and to have qualified registered people out there to ensure the public health and safety of the people of Illinois. And I would ask that the Members of the House vote to override the Total Veto on House Bill 1149."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1149 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Giglio in the Chair. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hartke, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 Yesterday, I stood in support of this Bill and I do again today. I think that when we look at the inspections done by cities and municipalities, counties for environmental

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

health practice reasons, I think we ought to have individuals who are definitely qualified and meet certain criteria so they don't make decisions that are arbitrary. And so, to have a common standard used throughout the state, I support this Motion to override the Governor's Veto, so we can again establish the Environmental Health Practice Act in the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Mr. Speaker, if this should receive the 71 votes necessary, I would like to verify it again. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 71 voting 'yes' and 46 voting 'no'. And the Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells asks for a verification. Does...Representative Parcells, does Matijevich have leave to be verified? Are there any absentees, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative DeJaegher."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative DeJaegher votes 'aye'. Read the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- O'Brien: "Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Clerk Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. DeLeo. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Jay Hoffman. Giorgi. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lanq. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Martinez. McAfee. McGann. Matijevich. Mautino. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Ronan. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Schakowsky. Stepan. Stern. Turner. Walsh. White. Williams. Trotter. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parcells, does Representative Steczo have leave to be verified? Leave is granted. Are there any questions of the affirmative?"

Parcells: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Farley. Is Representative Farley in the...Representative Farley is in the center aisle."

Parcells: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ronan. Representative Al Ronan in the chamber? Ronan. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Keane. Is Representative Keane in the chamber? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk, Representative Keane?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Giglio: "Kulas is in the...by the well."

Parcells: "Thank you. Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Morrow. Representative Morrow in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wyvetter Younge. Is

Representative Wyvetter Younge in the chamber? How is the

Lady recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Lady from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lou Jones. Representative Lou

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Jones in the chamber? How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Lady from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Art Turner. Representative Turner in the chamber? Representative Turner. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative McGann?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Andrew McGann. Representative McGann. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded,

Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Parcells: "Representative Trotter?"

Speaker Giglio: "Trotter is in his seat. Record...how is Representative Edley recorded, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Change Mr. Edley's vote to 'no'. Further questions?"

Parcells: "Did you...did we find, Representative Trotter?"

Speaker Giglio: "He's in his chair."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Parcells: "Thank you. We can take the record."

Speaker Giglio: "On this question there's 62 voting 'yes' and 47 voting 'no', and the Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2052, Representative Mautino. House Bill 2052. Representative Steczo, excuse me, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "What order are we following?"

Speaker Giglio: "We'll get back to that order. Representative Mautino, proceed. House Bill 2052."

Mautino, F.: "I move to override the Total Veto of House Bill 2052. This Bill amends the Illinois Human Rights Act, provides that it is a civil rights violation for an employer, employment agency, labor union, to inquire on a written application whether a job applicant does not or does consume alcohol. The operative word in this statement is, written. In the message on this Veto, there were issues addressed as to public health and safety that employers should know, and I feel that it is the responsibility of employers and employees to go through the these during the negotiations, the second phase of The reasoning behind this Bill, process for employment. and this is one that I happened to be present for the one that I had, was a...amends...what his concern was that should he check yes on a box, on a preemployment written would he not be considered as a candidate for the...for an interview or to move on to the next phase of His other concern was, if he checked no, this process. will that be a liability to him down the road. This is a double-edged sword. Does or does not consume alcohol. It effects an area which is not...not required for the actual performance of on the job. It is a lifestyle or a and as far the different life choice, as written

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

application for this, people are not hired or selected for a position on the basis of a written application, but they are eliminated on that basis from getting into the prescreening process. So I would move that...or ask that you all vote 'aye' to override the Veto on House Bill 2052."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2052 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. 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 71 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', and this Motion having received the required Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority is adopted and this Bill is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Preston, House Bill 915. Out of the record. On page 11 under Reduction Item Vetoes appears House Bill 651, Representative Saltsman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask your support for the Saltsman: override of this Reduction Item Veto. If this money is not returned to the Industrial Commission, the only permanent office in Central Illinois will be eliminated. This office serves a large area of population and is used extensively by our states largest industrial employer. This office was opened in Peoria to help handle the large caseload and backlog of cases handled by the Industrial Commission. This office was closed three years ago and reopened one year later because it was needed to carry the work load of the Industrial Commission. We're only talking about \$36,000 to keep it open for the rest...for this last half 1992 budget. So at that we talking about \$36,000, and οf sweep that much under the rug around this place regardless of what the finances of the state are. So I ask

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- for your support in passing this legislation to override this Reduction Item Veto."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none the question...Representative Olson, Robert."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is one of two as I'm Olson, aware of, Reduction Vetoes. The other was the million dollar item and barely eked out of here. This is for much less money, I believe it's \$36,000, \$36,100 if I recall. But a dollar is still a dollar when we have the fiscal shortfalls that we have in the state at this hour. I also recall, and I'm saying recall because I have lost my notes here. But the total appropriation for the Industrial Commission which was passed, was 11 million and some odd This was later amended by Representative dollars. Saltsman, not to change that appropriation but simply said, \$36,000 shall be spent on the Industrial Commission's facility in Peoria. Now, a question of the Representative, if he will?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."
- Olson, R.: "Representative Saltsman, I am told and you would have to enlighten me on specifics, if you could, that this office in Peoria has not consistently been opened over the last, let's say 10 years, is that true?"
- Saltsman: "Yes, it was closed, and it was reopened because of the workload of the Commission. It wouldn't have been reopened, Representative, if it wasn't needed. And therefore, we know it needs to stay open. Like I said, our states largest, probably, taxpayer in the industry in the State of Illinois probably gets as much use out of this as anyone."
- Olson, R.: "When is it due...it's due to close again if this is not passed. Is that..."
- Saltsman: "This just covers the last half year. This will run us

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- up into July of next year, and we'll be looking at a new budget."
- Olson, R.: "So it will take another appropriation then next year?"
- Saltsman: "Well, definitely, we'll have to look at...you're on the same Committee I'm on, and we'll be looking at that in our Appropriations Committee and you will have your say so then, also."
- Olson, R.: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House. This particular Industrial Commission Office has been on an open and closed basis for reasons that I am not sure of other than I do accept what Representative Saltsman just said. There are other Industrial Commission Offices about the state. Since this is asking...this is that we live within the appropriation for the Industrial Committee, it means that if it is restored, then those other offices about the state are going to have to lower their allocation under the current budget. So, if you're in an area in this state where you have one of these offices, you can see staff cuts there or whatever no matter what your workload is, if the Peoria office receives this \$36,000. I understand and applaud Representative Saltsman's efforts for the one in his particular area. But I think we have to go back to the original appropriation, what it was designed to serve and this is deduction from and I respectfully ask that you vote 'no' on this restoration. If this becomes close, we would like a verification."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Saltsman to close."
- Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we're looking at the \$36,000, we're not looking at the whole appropriations.

 When this office closes, they're going to have to rent temporary space in Peoria. They have already contacted

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

other buildings where they could rent offices on two and Now if you want to go into these other three day basis. office buildings for one day a week, four days a month, you're going to be paying a hundred and some dollars a day for rental on that office where it has to move to. Now the last time it closed, they worked out of a motel and they paid this motel rent in Pekin, Illinois, and it arrived at a very high cost because of only getting it on a one day per day basis. You're not losing that much money on it, because they're still going to have hearings. Even though they move those hearings into Galesburg on a day to day basis, maybe two days a month or they might move them into Lincoln, Illinois a couple days a month. If they still worked out of that area, they still have to pay rent on those facilities that they work with. So, the amount of days that they're going to be operating in Peoria, going to be paying rent somewhere. Now it is going to be on a temporary basis, it's going to eat up much of the \$36,000 we're talking about. It's a facility that is needed. It's a facility that was put back in operation because it was needed, and I said, it is only \$36,000 and I ask for your support."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer, are you seeking recognition?"

Homer: "Yes, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to rise to support the Gentleman's Motion to override...or rather to restore this Reduction Veto. I would like to point out as a State Representative that comes from the Peoria area and under the Republican map will actually have a district in the City of Peoria, that our area has about 350,000 population in the metropolitan area. Many of whom are employed in factories for Caterpillar in construction and other work related areas. It's a heavy blue collar area.

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

The Industrial Commission has its purpose to hear cases of disabled and injured workers under the Worker's Compensation Occupational Safety Acts. It's extremely vital to that region of the state that there be an accessible Industrial Commission Office. Without office these injured workers are forced to travel great incur greater legal expense. Clearly, Peoria is distance. an area that ought to be entitled to a branch Industrial Commission Office at the price tag of \$36,000. We would have a promotion of efficiency. And this Bill, I think, in the end would actually in the interest of efficiency save money. I would also like to remind the Gentleman who just spoke, although he hasn't sought my advice, I noticed that he will be taking over, under the new map, a large part of my district. And I would suggest to you that you may want to consult with the people in the Peoria area. Sir. And I think you would find that, in fact, they feel very strongly about the need to have this office where it is located. So, I hope you will take time to visit them and visit their views."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Robert Olson."

- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd simply like to point out that Representative Saltsman had closed, and you are still accepting remarks from the floor. And in that vein, I'm going to get in one last line. The Industrial Commission itself does not want this restoration."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall this item be restored to the its original amount notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, to explain my vote. The Industrial Commission does want this. They called me three days ago and asked me

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

to put this override in. So, it was a false report what was given to Representative Olson."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson."

- Olson, R.: "I've just looked around for their liaison, and he's not here but he has been sitting here for a day and a half at my side, and I am advised by him that they do not want this restoration. If he comes back...well, the liaison is here, and I don't agree with the Representative's last statement. Thank you."
- 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 74 'yes', 41 'no'. This Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores the line item. House Bill 2633, Representative Giorgi. On page 6 of the Calendar under Total Veto appears House Bill 2633, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Total Veto of House Bill 2633 on the discovery of America in 1492, and the celebration thereof. We introduced this Bill...the Speaker of the House introduced the Bill with all the 15 Italian American Members as Cosponsors. And the Bill provided to begin with there would be a 25 member commission, 5 members appointed by the Governor, 5 each by the leaders, and in the Executive Committee there was quite οf discussion on it, and they wanted more bit participation so they raised it to 50 where the Governor appointing 10 and the 4 Leaders appointing 10. Governor, in his wisdom, vetoed the Bill and made himself sole arbitrator of quincentenary celebration by the announcing that he will appoint 20 members by executive order. And I feel like, inasmuch as something like this happens once every 500 years, the 15 Italian Members of the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

General Assembly ought to at least be a part of this celebration. So, I would like to revert back to the original Bill...revert back to the original Bill without any rank or any ugly words, and I urge the support of the House."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Black.

Representative Black, are you seeking recognition, Sir?"

Black: "At the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker. Has he closed?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Black: "He has explained the Bill, okay. Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "He's explained the Bill."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative...oh, I didn't see the name up there on the board. But, it will not detour me, Sir. Did not the Governor create virtually the same Commission, with the same responsibilities and duties by executive order?"

Giorgi: "Governor Edgar?"

Black: "Pardon."

Giorgi: "Governor Edgar?"

Black: "Yes, the Governor. Hasn't he created, I think in his Veto Message..."

Giorgi: "No, I would be aware of it. I would be very much aware of it or very sensitive to it. He hasn't, to my knowledge, done this. The original Bill allowed for 25 members with the Governor appointing 5 and the legislative leaders appointing 5 each making it 25. In the Executive Committee, after some discussion, they thought that they would need more participation, so they amended it to include 50 people with the Governor appointing 10 and 4 legislative leaders appointing 10 each. He, in his wisdom, vetoed the Bill and made himself the sole arbitrator of

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

this quincentenary celebration and wants to appoint all 20 people. We are 15 Italian Americans in the House, and I have been the student of the Governor's appointments to his boards and commissions since he became Governor, and I don't see the 15 Italian Americans Members becoming a part of that 20 member commission. So, I would like to restore the Bill to its original contents."

Black: "Alright. My apologies to you, and I...in all due respect, I had been led to believe that he had created this commission, and I have just been informed that he has not created the commission, so I stand corrected and...thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I thought there was opposition, if not, I think it's just right that the Italian Americans in this House and in the Legislature ought to be proud as Italian will that the Americans we celebrate 5th...500th anniversary of the founding of this country. I don't know how anybody could be opposed when those Italian Americans did offer this Bill. I think the Veto...one might think it is self-serving, but I think it is unfortunate that the Governor did veto it. And I would say to those Italian Americans that the only thing I could find after 500 years that would be more rewarding that, we rediscover our country next year with an Italian American elected as president."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to explain to the previous speaker, how and why someone could be opposed to this. On the basis of the fact that there is serious doubt as to whether in fact Columbus did discover America, and due to the fact that there is not an equal number of Scandinavians on this

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

commission who really did discover America, I think that everybody ought to oppose it because it ought to be ethnic balanced. So that the Scandinavians could get a fair ethnic balance, so they get a fair representation on this commission to celebrate the discovery of America, which I certainly intend to do, but I think that Scandinavians ought to get their due and be represented on this commission. And that's why I'm going to oppose it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi to close. Oh, excuse me, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that Saint Brandon who really discovered America, an Irish Saint, and led the Scandinavians and the Italians over to this country as well, they would certainly be honored at this point to support this Resolution because it is...although we all know that it was the Irish that brought forth the rest of the tribes over, that it is very important to support the Italians and their quest for the honor, because they sunk a couple of ships on the way over. So, I'm happy to support this."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McGuire."

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

I'm also in support of this, but I would just like to clarify some things. The previous speaker spoke about the Irish, those guys sure make good beer but it's us Yugoslavians and southeastern ethnics that came over to this country that really made the cooperation and the contributions that make this country and the western hemisphere what it is today."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I welcome the support of the other ethnic groups that want credit. But I must remind them, the recorded history of the United States began with the voyage

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- of Columbus in 1492. But thank you for your support."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2633 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This if final action. 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 80 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is adopted, and this Bill having passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Schakowsky."
- Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make an announcement that the task force on circuit breaker reform will meet at 2:00 p.m. in Gary LaPaille's Office, in room 316."
- Speaker Giglio: "On page two of the Calendar under...appears

 Senate Bill 980. The Gentleman from Cook..."
- Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Bill 783, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill...oh, this is 980. Forget it."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 980, a Bill for an Act to amend the Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Capparelli."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Yes, Amendment #1 to House (sic Senate) Bill 980 will enable the customers of one bank with the multiholding company to cash checks and deposit loan payments into the accounts of the office of an affiliate bank. This is the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

only Amendment, and I would like to put the Amendment on today and call the Bill next week for a vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Representative .

Black."

Black: "Very quickly, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "This Amendment simply says, that if my small bank is purchased by a large conglomerate, we'll call it Last Chance National, that I can still continue to go to my former bank and still make deposits. And in other words, it's convenience. I don't have to go to a downtown branch or whatever else."

Capparelli: "No."

Black: "I could make deposits and cash checks, is that where you're headed with this?"

Capparelli: "At the affiliate banks, you will be able to cash checks and make deposits in the affiliate bank."

Black: "Okay. Can you define affiliate bank for me?"

Capparelli: "Affiliate facility is a bank, a main banking premise or branch in the state, another commonly owned bank that is the main banking premises in the state. In other words, one bank would have...we passed a Holding Company Bill about 8 years ago."

Black: "Okay, I'm with. Thank you."

Capparelli: "Alright."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. On Conference Committee Report on page 2 is House Bill 1078. 1078. (Tape malfunction)."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, that's my Motion so we can bring this up, but I think somebody else has got the Bill, House Bill 1078. But the Motion is to having voted on the prevailing

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

side, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Second Conference Committee Report was adopted, take from the table and suspend Rule 79(c) and place it on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Got that? Mr. Speaker, to explain what the Bill does, if anybody is concerned about it. This is a matter where somebody was elected to a..."

Speaker Giglio: "(Tape inaudible)."

Capparelli: "Pursuant to Rule 73, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1078 passed the House."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. When was this vote taken?"

Capparelli: "Last Spring."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman reported it was in Spring Session."

Black: "How many votes does it take to suspend Rule 73(a) under this Gentleman's Motion?"

Speaker Giglio: "What was the last comment?"

Black: "How many votes does it take to suspend Rule 73(a) under the Motion at hand?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that it takes 60 votes. Representative Hartke, are you seeking recognition?"

Hartke: "Yes, I would like an inquiry of the Chair. For what reason are we reconsidering the vote, Representative Capparelli? Was there a technical error in the..."

Speaker Giglio: "(Inaudible Tape). Committee Report and the Senate adopted another one, Corrected Conference Committee Report. So we adopt the same one."

Hartke: "Sounds reasonable to me."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "I have...had some people telling me as to why this was

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

done, why we need to do this, and I don't want to stand in the road of progress. There seems to be some strong sentiment on both sides of the aisle for this, but I guess my inquiry of the Chair is, if you suspend Rule 73(a) then what authority do you have to reconsider a vote from the previous Session? Are you sure you want to suspend Rule 73(a)?"

- Speaker Giglio: "What everybody is trying to do is to...as to what this Motion must be made. The rules provide that the Motion must be made on the day of the vote or the day after. This will suspend that provision."
- Black: "I have been consulted by one of my designated rule interpreters, and I have been told that...and I withdraw my inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Representative Capparelli now moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1078 Second Conference Committee was adopted, and take from the table and suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Any discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're only suspending 79(e) on this Bill. Correct?"

Speaker Giglio: "That's correct."

Black: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave by the Attendance Roll Call to suspend Rule 79(e)? Hearing none. The Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries.

Now, Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 1078, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have this in line, what the Conference Committee Report does, it allows an overlap in terms of members of local school boards and

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

the community college board. When a local school board member is elected to a community college board, that member may serve the remainder of his or her year on that board but not run for reelection. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Conference Committee Report be adopted...Second Conference Committee Report? Second Corrected Conference Committee Report be adopted to House Bill 1078?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1078, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. All right, on page 7 of the Calendar, Total Veto Motions. Representative Obrzut on House Bill 1035."
- Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the move that we override the Governor's Veto on House. Ι House Bill 1035. House Bill 1035 creates the Industrial Hygiene Licensing Act to provide for the licensure of hygienists and industrial industrial hygienist technologists by the Department of Public Health. House Bill 1035 is a constructive environmental and public health Bill with no impact on the GRF. However, the Governor vetoed it, and I would respectively request an 'aye' vote on this. Thanks."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me just repeat what we said about 30

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

minutes ago, and you upheld the Veto. There were six new Regulatory Acts passed by the General Assembly. The Governor vetoed all of them, saying truthfully and factually that we didn't appropriate start-up dollars for any of these Acts. Therefore, because of the we have laid off 22 people in the Department of Professional Regulations. We do not have the \$750,000 it would take to start the process to put all six of these Acts in line to be done by the Department, what has to be Now, given that fact, and you just turned one down 30 or 40 minutes ago, I would suggest to you that you need to turn this one down as well for the same reasons. I would request your 'no' vote and Mr. Speaker, should it get the requisite number of votes to pass, I will request a verification."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Obrzut to close."

you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like an 'aye' Obrzut: "Thank vote. I would like to mention that the Governor did sian House Bill 2012 which does license industrial radiographers. It's a Bill that the Governor just recently signed. I don't see any reason why we can't include the 500 industrial hygienists that this would include. I think it's a good Bill, and I would appreciate your support. Thanks."

Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to remind the Body that we have a number of Bills and a number of individual Members would like some of these Bills...or the vote verified. So, the Chair would like to inform the Members to vote their own switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1035 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Representative Regan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Regan: "Well, my light was on for about two or three minutes here so, I just thought that before you close I'd like to

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

say..."

Speaker Giglio: "Your light wasn't on when I asked Representative Obrzut to close. The only lighted one that was on was Representative Black. You can explain your vote. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As a coach...as a Minority Leader on R&R, of the 29 licensure Bills that came through this year, this was the only one that I supported, and I suppose that I ought to tell you why. An industrial hygienist sounds kind of vague. I want to explain very clearly what they do. They go into businesses and they look for poisons to employers, employees, and to the environment and then they offer solutions on how they can clean up their act. I think it's a new field. I think it takes exact licensing and training, and if my sons were younger I would certainly have them go into this field, And I would urge you to because it is well needed. override the Governor's Veto in this one instance."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ryder, one minute to explain your vote."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if there was any more of these kind of Bills. If there are, I was going to suggest that Representative Black could simply refer to his previous speeches by number and save us some time."

Speaker Giglio: "The point is well taken. 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 62 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', and this Motion having failed to receive the required Three—Fifths Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative White, Jesse White, House Bill 2293. Out of the record. House Bill 2364,

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Representative Edley. 2364, amends the Civil Administrative Code."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This Bill is a tax expenditure report that would require the Governor to review tax incentives that we've provided and make an annual report in his budget to the Legislature. I would ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would strongly urge that we not override Governor's Veto on this. Do you know what tax expenditure is? Well, that's kind of a euphemism. That's saying the money belongs to us, the government, and through our good graces we are allowing you, citizens and the taxpayers, to keep some of it. Folks, that's back ass wards. You know, it belongs, it belongs in the pockets of the taxpayers. We don't have to issue tax expenditure reports from our side telling them what good...how good of people we are by allowing them to claim It's a bad idea. We shouldn't start various deductions. it. We should maintain...sustain the Governor's Veto, and a 'no' vote would be the right vote on this."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, did in fact not the Governor sign a Bill very similar to this and that perhaps, for whatever other reasons may be involved, but I think one of the reasons the Governor vetoed this was that he considers it a duplicative or conflictive Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Edley."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Edley: "...vetoed this Bill. There was an outcry at least Illinois about the financial implications of central vetoing a Bill like this. Especially, when we have hundreds of millions of dollars of unpaid bills out there. And then he amendatorily vetoed another Bill that would have required the Governor to report to the Comptroller, not the General Assembly on this similar kind of incentives. I feel as a Member of the General Assembly and as...that we are constitutionally the proper Body in which to review these tax expenditure reports from the Governor. And so, I think this Bill is the proper Bill, and it is the place for the Governor to make his report. Not to the Comptroller but to the General Assembly."

Black: "Is the Bill that you're referring to that there was supposedly an outcry on, was that Senate Bill 1172?"

Edley: "No."

Black: "I thought that was the one he signed."

Edley: "Is that the Demuzio Bill?"

Black: "Hang on, let me see if we can find it. Senate Bill 1172,

I believe, is the Bill that the Governor signed and,
therefore, feels that 2364 is somewhat of a duplicate Bill.
Yes, it is a Senator Demuzio Bill, Cosponsored by Senator
Topinka."

Edley: "Okay. The Governor vetoed this Bill, 23...House Bill 2364. There was some editorials in the Peoria Journal Star, other newspapers, that this was a silly thing for him to do. I mean, we have the Auditor General, the Taxpayers Foundation, questioning a number of our tax practices, and that amounts to tens of millions of dollars. After the outcry from the media, I think the Comptroller met with the Governor, and they found this other Bill and he amendatorily vetoed the Senate Bill after...after he had vetoed this House Bill 2364. I just feel that the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

appropriation process is vested in the General Assembly and not the Comptroller, and I think the Governor saw the error of his ways and made a change in the Senate Bill, but possibly, because he couldn't have reversed his Amendatory Veto to this House Bill. I think we should use the good judgement of the General Assembly in overriding his Veto and require that the reporting be made to this Body."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Obviously, we have some information that perhaps is in conflict. I'm not even sure which Bill was signed first or which Bill might have been amendatorily vetoed first, but it appears that a Bill doing the Representative would like, has been signed into It's my understanding with the full advice and consent of the Comptroller and that this represents a suggestion that had been made some years ago by the Illinois Fiscal Commission. So, that perhaps what the Gentleman is asking us to do is to be somewhat of a duplicate as to what is already done. And if that's not the case, and if I have misrepresented that, then certainly I would join with the Gentleman in the Spring Session to make some corrections that might be necessary to what is now a Public Act. But, until we can perhaps get a more in-depth information, at this point, I don't think any us want to see the Illinois Revised Statutes go to another two or three volumes. So, if in fact, the Governor feels that he has signed what this Sponsor wants in this House Bill, as a Senate Bill, then perhaps we should just simply uphold the Governor's Veto on this and vote 'no', and then we can get whatever difficulties seem to be the case between Representative Edley and the Governor's Office and the Comptroller in the Spring Session. But, I don't

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

think we need to put similar laws or the same laws in statute books that are already far too large. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Edley to close."

Edley: "Well, I am very aware of the sequence of the Governor's actions. The Governor amendatorily vetoed this Bill, got some public flak about it and then amendatorily signed the Senate Bill. I would think that Members of the General Assembly would want to maintain the integrity of our constitutional responsibility and have the Governor make the report, not to the Comptroller, but to the General Assembly in the Governor's Budget Message. I would just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 23...excuse me, Representative Black."

Black: "Speaker, with the courtesy and consent of the Chair while
I was up, I forgot to indicate that I will seek a
verification should this get the requisite number. Will
you entertain that request, please?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Chair will certainly do so."

Black: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Please vote your own switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2364 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there is 66 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', and this Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Matijevich."

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

I would like to have unanimous consent in the use of the Attendance Roll Call to suspend the rule whereby a

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Committee cannot meet while the House is in Session, and the posting notice, so that House Bill 2611 can be held immediately in the conference room back here. The Rules Committee for the purposes of exempting House Bill 2611. I was going to discuss it with Bill Black but he was busy, and I cleared it with Representative 'Dino Purdue' over there. So, everything is alright."

Speaker Giglio: "That's fine. Does the Gentleman have leave to have the Rules meeting? Hearing none, leave is granted.

Representative Mautino, for what purpose...the Rules Committee immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room.

Representative Mautino are you seeking recognition?

Alright, page 7, Total Vetoes. We'll go right down the line. House Bill 1971, Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to override the Steczo: Governor's Veto of House Bill 1971, which is a Bill provides title protection to professional counselors in the State of Illinois. This Bill is significant because in the of Illinois right now, we currently license State psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, but the one group that's probably closest and has more contact with individuals in the state are professional counselors. Those counselors now are not bound by any kind of education requirements are anything else. So you or I, even though we're unqualified can hang out the shingle and call ourselves counselors and the public has no protection. fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a map that the professional counselors have made available which will show that in many counties in the state, there are no psychologists, there are no psychiatrists, there are no social workers. So counselors are the only mental health professionals that individuals, in fact, may contact. The Governor's comment in his Veto Message was that the start-up costs would

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

inhibit this Bill...the state from being able to pay for the costs associated with starting up this program. I would like the Members of this House to know, that the Department of Professional Regulation, last May, provided a fiscal note that showed that the start—up costs for this program were \$80,000. The first year revenues would be \$825,000. So, for start—up costs of \$80,000, revenues the first year of \$825,000 and over four years net revenues to the state of \$834,000, this is a Bill that will pay for itself, number one, but secondly, definitely is in the best interests of our constituents in the State of Illinois. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Please refer to my previous recorded remarks on Professional Regulatory Acts. By the most optimistic standards, even if this Bill does pay for itself, it ain't going to pay for the start—up costs of all the Acts you want to override. You have voted 'no' before, I ask you to vote 'no' now, and if it gets the requisite number, I want a verification."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I think that was Mr. Black's speech number two and a half because he added to it. But, nevertheless, think about it, 80,000 start—up, 825,000 at the end of the first year. I think that certainly makes sense, and in addition, we are protecting the Illinois public from being...from going to individuals and professionals seeking help that actually do not have any qualifications. This is an excellent Bill. This really does complete the mental health professional cycle. Illinois needs this badly, and I would ask for your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Giglio: "Please vote your own switch. The question is,

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

'Shall the House pass...or 'Shall House Bill 1971 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn, are you seeking recognition?"

Dunn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote."

Speaker Giglio: "One minute."

Dunn: "This is good legislation, we just need a few more votes up there. Notwithstanding Mr. Black's speech, two or two and a half, this is something that the professionals in this area have been seeking for a long time, and it certainly is not going to be disruptive to state revenues. And professionals want this kind of licensing to ensure that the people that are associated with them in their field are properly qualified. If they want to see that their own profession is policed and regulated, the least we can do is accommodate them. So please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 68 voting 'yes', and 36 voting 'no'. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Capparelli. Davis. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Lou Jones. Kulas. Richmond. Ronan. Santiago and Williams."

Speaker Giglio: "Any further questions? Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded 'no', please."

Speaker Giglio: "Record the Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick, as voting 'no', Mr. Clerk. Further changes?

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Hearing none, take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 68 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. This Motion having failed to receive the required Three—Fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Committee Report. Message from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A 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 the passage of a Bill of the following title to
wit; House Bill 2611 together with attached Amendment,
Senate Amendment #1, passed the Senate as amended October
24, 1991. Linda Hawker, Secretary.'"

Speaker Giglio: "Committee Report."

Clerk Leone: "Committee Report. The Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following Bill has been ruled exempt on October 24th, 1991; House Bill 2611."

Speaker Giglio: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #2 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker Giglio: "Following the number of Bills on page 7 under

Total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 2005, Representative

Edley."

Edley: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This Bill is a very simple Bill. It passed out of here 106 to nothing. All it does is require open meetings and adds some sunshine on four tourism council's operations of their board of directors and employees. Here a couple of years ago there was some financial conflicts of interest which the media in the Peoria area exposed. In fact, just recently they won a press association award for their news story. This Bill simply requires these tourism councils to have open meetings, and to have their directors and employees

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

acknowledge any conflicts of interest, and I would ask for a favorable vote on this. There is a bipartisan support, and I don't see any reason why this shouldn't get the 106 plus votes again."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm a hyphenated Cosponsor of this Bill as well. This makes imminent good sense. It's good government. There isn't a reason in the world that this kind of money should not require these regional tourism councils to have public meetings. There have been instances of abuse throughout our state and a little sunshine here is badly needed, and I would strongly urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Wennlund: "What was the stated reason that the Governor vetoed this Bill in the first instance."

- Edley: "It is my understanding that he didn't feel that DCCA should have responsibility for insuring that this...insuring the application of the Open Meetings Act. And it is also my understanding that they wouldn't have that responsibility under this Bill."
- Wennlund: "Well, it appears in the body of the Bill that DCCA indeed would be involved in monitoring a local body's compliance with the Open Meetings Act, and under the current law, that responsibility rests with the state's attorneys in each county and with the judicial system in that county."
- Edley: "The department has a contractual relationship with these quasi-public agencies, and there is nothing wrong with requiring them to put in that contractual relationship that the tourism councils will do specific things to maintain

- 99th Legislative Day October 24, 1991 and spend this money in an open forum. So, I can't see any conflict there."
- Wennlund: "Is the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs currently monitoring compliance by any other governmental agencies or units of local government?"

Edley: "I'm not aware of any."

- Wennlund: "So, this in effect would be the first time. Is that correct?"
- Edley: "I'm not aware...I can't say one way or the other,

 Representative."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does, it attempts to shift responsibility for the Open Meetings Act and enforcement of the Open Meetings Act for the general public from the state's attorneys in each of the 102 counties in Illinois to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs has had its budget trimmed this year, is having to lay off, and now we seek to put additional responsibility on that department. And that's why the Governor really vetoed it, because the department does not have the personnel. It's because it would having layoffs, and shift the responsibility for the Open Meetings Act and enforcement of the provisions of the Open Meetings Act from each individual state's attorneys in each county Illinois, to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs who simply does not have the manpower to do it. Speaker, if this Bill receives the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Edley to close."

Edley: "Well, the state's attorneys wouldn't have any justification to make these quasi-public agencies meet the Open Meetings Act. They aren't currently required to do

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

so. This puts into a contractual relationship between the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and Tourism Councils which are spending 90% of their money, hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers money behind closed doors. And in the specific instance in my region there was a director who was renting a building which he owned to the tourism council, had collected over \$100,000 in advertising for a newspaper that he put out and owned personally. It was a clear public abuse of public moneys. To allow that to go own while the state is faced in severe financial condition is a reckless disregard for the integrity of this process. I would urge an 'aye' vote. There isn't any reason to vote 'no' on this. This is a bipartisan Bill, and I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2005 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. 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 73 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. Representative Wennlund asks for a verification. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "A poll of those not voting. Farley. Lou Jones.

 Kirkland. Kulas. Laurino. Ronan and White."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund, there is a number of people that want leave to be verified. Balanoff. Currie.

 Andrew McGann. Monroe Flinn. Satterthwaite. Anybody else want to be verified? Alright. Mr. Clerk, Representative White wants to vote 'aye'. Representative Satterthwaite, leave to be verified. Representative Rice, you want...are you voting? Representative Phelps. Does he have leave to be verified? Representative Deering. Anybody else? Proceed with the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Clerk Leone: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Ackerman. Capparelli. Conkling. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. Dunn. Edley. Flinn. Flowers. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren. Shirley Jones. Keane. Lang." Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Wennlund, does Representative White have leave to be verified? Go ahead."

Clerk Leone: "LeFlore. Leitch. Levin. Marinaro. Martinez. McAfee. Mautino. McAuliffe. Matijevich. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Munizzi. McGuire. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Pullen. Rice. Richmond. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Sieben. Steczo. Stepan. Turner. Walsh. White. Williams. Wolf. Stern. Trotter. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker." Speaker McPike: "Who's doing the verification. Mr. Wennlund, questions of the affirmative?"

Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker McPike: "Who?"

Wennlund: "McAuliffe. Roger McAuliffe."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McAuliffe here? He's not. Take him off the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Shaw."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Shaw. Shaw's not here. Just a minute.

We've got Burke, Bugielski, Jones, Mautino, Phelan,

Marinaro, Lou Lang and Hartke and McNamara. Could they be

verified?"

Wennlund: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "And Munizzi. Okay. Alright, go ahead. Who did
you have, Shaw?"

Wennlund: "Shaw."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "And Monique Davis, she's here. Mr. Shaw is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Trotter."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Trotter? He's not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Jones."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, wait a minute, here's Donne. He's here.

Trotter's here. Return him to the Roll Call."

Wennlund: "Representative Lou Jones."

Speaker McPike: "Was she one that we just verified? No."

Wennlund: "Not to my knowledge."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, that was Shirley Jones. You're right.

She's not voting. Mr. Wennlund, she's not voting."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative Richmond."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Richmond's not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Stepan."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stepan is not here. Remove her from the roll. And Schakowsky would like to be verified."

Wennlund: "Yes. Representative Ronan."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ronan is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Ronan's not voting. Who was the next one?

Turner?"

Wennlund: "Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Morrow."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Morrow. Mr. Morrow is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Mulcahey is not here. Remove him from the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Flinn is not here. Remove him from the roll."

Wennlund: "Monique..."

Speaker McPike: "We verified Monique. Woolard is here to be verified. Woolard."

Wennlund: "Representative Hicks."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hicks is in his chair."

Wennlund: "No further."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. On this Motion there are 66 'ayes' and 38 'nos', and the Motion having failed to receive a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Alright, the Chair...there are some Democrats in the rear in a meeting, and if the Members would vote their own switch. If you know someone's not here don't vote them, we don't have to go through a verification on every Bill. So if you know the Member's not here, don't vote the Member. House Bill 2293, Mr. White. Mr. White. Out of the record. 2364. Mr. Edley, did we do that? 2420, Mr. Mautino. 2421. Mr. Morrow. Charles Morrow. Representative Walsh, 2463, we done that? You want to do Out of the record. 2464, do you wish to do that one? Mr. Walsh, 2464."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to override the Veto in relationship to House Bill 2464, which in effect is providing a pilot project in relationship to adult day care facilities and in so doing, it is going to fill a very very important need right now. We have presently since January 1st, had in the State of Illinois 11 adult day projects close down. What we're running into...is not merely funding problems, but what we're running into is attendance problems, and with a project of

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

this type, we will see the possibilities that are there in relationship to encouraging the private sector. Now, we have information through the various associations involved that there are interests here in relationship to this by large major corporations such as IBM, AT&T. The firms that are realizing this are looking at it from the standpoint of offering assistance to their employees so that the adults who are under these projects will be involved in situations where they are private funded, as well as, public funded. And of course, this particular pilot will be addressing that and that's the scope of it. I request a favorable roll."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, Representative Hultgren." Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Motion to override, and not because I believe that adult day care is a luxury in terms of the human service needs in State of Illinois, but rather because it is a need which we have already addressed. Indeed. the department already has budgeted \$5 million for the provision of adult day care in the State of Illinois. And although this...there is a representation that there would be no cost involved with this pilot program which would duplicate the \$5 million of program money that the department already In fact, it would cost the state has in its budget. approximately \$100,000. One of the things that we as Assembly must do, is to divide the resources of the state among the many competing needs. We did that before we left here on July have done that. 18th, and we allocated, and the Governor approved \$5 million for adult day care. That's what we plan to spend this year. We can't spend a little more here and little more there, because it isn't in the budget for that allocation. It's a worthy program and the Sponsor is

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

intended, but we've made other provisions for adult day care in our budget and this simply is not provided for. So I would reluctantly ask that Members on this side and on the other side of the aisle recognizing the physical limitations of this years budget, uphold the Governor's Veto on this particular measure."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another budget buster, and Mr. Speaker, in the event this Bill receives the required vote, I request a verification."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2464 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. And please don't vote Members that are not here. Have all voted? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take wish? the record. On this Motion there are 48 'ayes' and 45 The Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority is hereby declared lost. Mr. Woolard. Mr. Woolard. Mr. Curran. 2536, out of the record. Mr. Phelps. David Phelps. Supplemental Calendar Supplemental Calendar #2 on Concurrence, announcement. Representative Mautino. Representative Black Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "I believe that Representative Mautino is not available at this time, and as Cosponsor I'd ask leave to handle the Bill if that's acceptable with the Body and the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, proceed Sir. House Bill 2611."

Ryder: "At this time I would move pursuant to Rule 74(a) to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Concurrence."

Speaker McPike: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call is used, and the Motion

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

carries. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, and I note for the record that Representative Mautino has joined us at this point. At this point, I would ask to concur on the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2611."

Speaker McPike: "The Calendar shows Amendment #1."

Ryder: "That is correct, and I should have said that."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Any objections? No one standing in opposition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2611?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are lll 'ayes' and no 'nays', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2611, and this Bill having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Brunsvold, page two of the Calendar. House Bill 1405."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1405 is an LRB, Legislative Reference Bureau cleanup Bill...revisory Bill. Representative Hultgren and I have been working with the Reference Bureau as part of the board. This is an early revisory Bill. The Amendment is before you. Staff has the Amendment. I would like at this time to move to suspend the printing requirements on that Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Mr. Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I concur in the Motion and would ask a favorable Roll Call on the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, you heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Do adopt the Motion?' Attendance roll will be used and the Motion carries. Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, and I move to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1405."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The question is, Shall
Amendment #1 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. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1405, a Bill for an Act relating to the first 1991 Revisory Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. This Bill now would...really is a short revisory Bill. It's done this Fall because there are some conflicts that need to be addressed before the January 1, deadline or creation of some new Acts that need to be clarified for the circuit clerks. And staff has looked at these, and I would ask for the passage of Senate Bill 1405."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would echo the comments of the Sponsor and would say that both staffs has had a chance to look at this. It makes no substantive changes and is typical of the kind of revisory Bills which we pass annually here."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1405 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 105 'ayes' and no 'nays'.

And Senate Bill 1405 having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Representative Phelps on a Motion on House Bill 2581."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 2581. Most of us know we've struggled with ways in the last few years to try to effectively come up with solutions to have incentives that

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

would get to the heart of the medically under served areas, much of which are rural, but not entirely, some are in urban cities. But this is one such Bill that does get to that matter in a very effective way. The Governor did veto I...in his message the only thing that he questioned was that it might be duplicating law that there is existing law under the Allied Health Care Professional Assistance Law, which includes not only physician assistants health, but for all allied health professionals. Well, that's the point of the Bill. The Bill was to try to target manpower shortage areas in areas that are medically under served by professionals, by doctors who cannot get Cairo, to Metropolis or Hardin County in instances like we are very much realizing in other areas of the urban setting. way to offer some real assistance is those position assistants. To increase their return to rural medically under served areas would be to provide the incentive such as in this Bill, and it does not cost state anything. In this Bill we're talking about the public health actually positioning the physician assistants in way that they could be recognized, that when funds are available that the scholarships and other incentives would be in place to lure them to areas in absence of a doctor, to be advised by a doctor, and therefore, function in the way physician assistants as graduated from their university setting. That's what this Bill does, and I appreciate your consideration to override this Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

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

House. I rise in opposition to the Motion to override..."

Speaker McPike: "And you request a verification?"

Wennlund: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2581 pass,

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Again, vote your own switch. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Homer, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 53 'ayes', 53 'ayes' and 30 'nos', and this Motion having failed to receive the Three—Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Woolard. Alright, Mr. Leitch. I understand you have a Motion, Sir. What's the Bill number?"

Leitch: "House Bill 1352. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker McPike: "Did the First Conference Committee fail? Did the First Conference Committee fail?"

Leitch: "No, it has not been rejected here."

Speaker McPike: "Pardon me."

Leitch: "No. It went to the Senate, it failed in the Senate."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, the First Conference Committee has failed in the Senate. The Gentleman has requested a Second Conference Committee on House Bill 1352, and it will be appointed."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone on the House floor have a Motion that they would like to call or a Bill that they would like to call? Okay. Tony, read...Mr. Clerk read the...oh, Mr. Black has a Bill he would like to hear."

Black: "Oh, no, no, no, no. I just have an inquiry of the Chair,
Mr. Speaker. There are times that I often don't hear you,
and I just want to make sure in an inquiry of the Chair
that on House Calendar Supplemental #1, we have not
suspended the appropriate rule on any of those Bills. Is
that not correct?"

Speaker McPike: "I think there is only one Bill on on..."

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Black: "No, House Supplemental #1 there's a whole bunch of
 Motions and I..."

Speaker McPike: "Well, we didn't do any of those Motions."

Black: "We haven't done any of those Motions."

Speaker McPike: "No."

Black: "Well, thank you very much. I needed that on the record.

Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "No, we haven't done any of those Motions. We could if you wish, sit here and call all of these. We would if we had the votes. Alright, does anyone have a Bill they'd like called? Any Motions to be heard? Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 101, resolved by the Senate by the 87th General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, October 24, 1991 they stand adjourn until Wednesday November 6, 1991 at 12:00 o'clock noon."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, the Veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, the passage of which I am instructed to as concurrence of the House to wit; Senate Bills #407, 435, 644, 725, 973, 1020, 1037, 1058, and 1353, passed the Senate October 22, 23 and 24, 1991, by a Three-Fifths vote. Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.' A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are attached to the Bills of the following title. The acceptance of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit; Senate Bills #42, 175, 789, 1006, 1030, 1086, 1172, and 1283. Action taken by the Senate October 22, 23, and 24, 1991. Secretary of the Senate.' Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the passage of which I instructed to ask concurrence οf the House οf #934. Representatives to wit; Senate Bill passed the Senate October 24, 1991. Linda Hawker, Secretary.'"

Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1151, offered by Representative Flinn; 1153, Turner; 1154, Woolard; 1158, Cowlishaw; 1159, Ryder; 1160, Robert Olson; 1161, Morrow; House Joint Resolution 82, Speaker Madigan; Senate Joint Resolution 91, Hensel; 92, Black; 94, Stepan; 95, Stepan; 97, Churchill; 98, Curran; and Senate Joint Resolution 100, Churchill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, these are all agreed. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 93, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge with respect to the memory of Miles Dewey Davis, III. House Resolution 1131, offered by Representative Johnson with respect to the memory of Charles Osgood. House Resolution 1152, offered by Representative Turner with respect to the memory of Josha

99th Legislative Day

- October 24, 1991
- Wordlaw. House Resolution 1156, offered by Representative Matijevich with respect to the memory of Barbara Behm."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1155, offered by Representative

 Deuchler; 1157, offered by Representative Santiago; House

 Joint Resolution 84, offered by Representative Johnson and

 Senate Joint Resolution 96, offered by Representative

 Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Allowing Perfunctory time for the Clerk for Introductions First Readings, Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stands adjourn until Wednesday...Wednesday, November 6, 1991, at 12:00 noon. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills. Bill 2668, offered by Representative Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend Property Tax Extention Limitation Act. First Réading of the Bill. House Bill 2669, offered by Representative Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Property Tax Extension Limitation Act. First Reading of 2670, offered by Representative the Bill. House Bill Davis, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation of prerecorded videotape rentals. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2671, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Reading οf the Bill. House Bill 2672, offered by Representative Deering, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2673, offered by Representative Levin, a Bill for Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. First Reading

99th Legislative Day

October 24, 1991

of the Bill. House Bill 2674, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

92/09/16

08:51:18

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

$\alpha c \tau$	0000	2.6	1001	
ULI	OBER	240	1991	

HB-0012	MOTION	PAGE	32
HB-0050	MOTION	PAGE	14
HB-0274	MOTION	PAGE	22
HB-0274	MOTION	PAGE	27
HB-0318	MOTION	PAGE	34
HB-0376	MOTION	PAGE	52
HB-0475	MOTION	PAGE	43
HB-0614	MOTION	PAGE	44
HB-0651	MOTION	PAGE	81
H8-0673	MOTION	PAGE	7
HB-0827	MOTION	, PAGE	48
HB-1035	MOTION	PAGE	94
HB-1078	CONFERENCE	PAGE	92
HB-1149	MOTION	PAGE	73
HB-1352	MOTION	PAGE	116
H8-1405	THIRD READING	PAGE	114
HB-1405	MOTION	PAGE	113
HB-1499	MOTION	PAGE	6
HB-1838	MOTION	PAGE	33
HB-1971	MOTION	PAGE	101
HB-2005	MOTION	PAGE	104
HB-2052	MOTION	PAGE	80
HB-2085	MOTION	PAGE	6
HB-2364	MOTION	PAGE	97
HB-2464	MOTION	PAGE	110
HB-2581		PAGE	114
HB-2611	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
HB-2633		PAGE	86
H8-2668	FIRST READING	PAGE	119
HB-2669	FIRST READING	- PAGE	119
	FIRST READING	PAGE	119
HB-2671	FIRST READING	PAGE	119
	FIRST READING	PAGE	119
HB-2673	FIRST READING	PAGE	119
HB-2674	FIRST READING	PAGE	120
SB-0250	MOTION	PAGE	63
SB-0708	CONFERENCE	PAGE	65
SB-0708		PAGE	63
SB-0980	SECOND READING	PAGE	90
HJR-0079	MOTION	PAGE	2
HJR-0079		PAGE	4
HJR-0081		PAGE	4
HJR-0081		PAGE	5
SJR-0101		PAGE	117
SJR-0101	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	117

SUBJECT MATTER

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

92/09/16 08:51:18

OCTOBER 24. 1991

SUBJECT MATTER

DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	118
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	119
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	119
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	119
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	120