

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

November 19, 1986

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Members will be at their desks. All unauthorized persons will please vacate. Our guests in the gallery will please rise. Our prayer this morning will be by the Reverend John Spreen, Church of the Little Flower, Springfield, Illinois. Father Spreen.

REVEREND JOHN SPREEN:

(Prayer given by Reverend Spreen)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Reading of the Journal. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Thursday, November 6th; Tuesday, November 18th, in the year 1986, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion as posed by Senator Kelly. Are there any objections? If not, so ordered. Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

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

House Joint Resolution 237, it's congratulatory.

238 is congratulatory.

240 is a death resolution.

And 241 is congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1250 offered by Senator Berman, congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 1251, Senator Lechowicz, congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 1252, by Senators Hall, Rock and all Senators and it's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 1253, by Senator O'Daniel, it's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 1254, by Senator Maitland and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 2306 introduced by Senators Schuneman, Philip, Weaver, DeAngelis, Davidson and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2307, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2308, the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2309, the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2310, the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2311, the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

✓ 2312, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2313, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2314, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Rules. All right, with leave of the Body, we'll go back to the Order of Resolutions. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolutions...1255 and 1256 offered by Senator Fawell, both congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1257 and 1258, by Senator Berman, both congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Consent Calendar. Senator Berman, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BERMAN:

Mr. President, on 1257, 1258 and there was one that was read earlier, will those be adopted today on the Consent Calendar?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Well, Senator Berman, we are here tomorrow. It's my understanding that they will be on the Consent Calendar for tomorrow.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Okay, I meant today or tomorrow. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Yes.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right, with leave of the Body, we'll go back to the Order of Resolutions. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

...Senate Resolution 1259 offered by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

(Secretary reads SR 1259)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce. Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I think the resolution as read is explanatory and I would move for its adoption at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Joyce moves the adoption of Senate Resolution...all right, Senator Joyce moves for the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Resolution 1259. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Jeremiah Joyce now moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1259. Discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. All right, WCIA-TV, Channel 3 has requested permission to videotape the Senate proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1260 offered by Senators Keats, it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise? Could we break up the conferences? Could we break up the conferences on the Floor? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like the record to reflect, with leave of the Body, that Senator Vadalabene is absent today due to illness. And, in that respect, I would call for a Democratic Caucus immediately in Room 212, probably take...we can Recess till about one-thirty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator...Senator Rupp.

SB 1516
Amended

SENATOR RUPP:

Republican Caucus, Senator Philip's office right away.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIIO)

All right. So the...Senator Rock has moved that the Senate Recess till the hour of one-thirty. Democratic Caucus in 212, Republican Caucus in Senator Philip's office. The Senate will stand in Recess till the hour of one-thirty.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. If I can have the attention of the membership, we will begin on page 13 of the Calendar and we will proceed with motions in writing as they pertain to gubernatorial action. So it will be pages 13, 14 and 15 and 16. We will go right down the line, then we will go back on the regular Calendar and then we will handle any motions in writing that have subsequently been filed. The bottom of page 13 on the Calendar, Senator Welch, are you prepared to proceed? On the Order of Motions in Writing to Override Total Vetoes, there's a motion in writing with respect to Senate Bill 1516, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that Senate Bill 1516 Do Pass, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Welch.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1516 is the English proficiency bill. What this bill does is require that classroom instructors in universities in the State of Illinois be able to fluently speak the English language. The structure requiring them to do so is that the governing boards of each university system set forth a program

requiring a test of some sort to be left to the...to the university governing system analyzing the ability of each classroom instructor to speak the language fluently. The bill passed the Senate with forty-five votes this past spring, it passed the House with, I believe, eighty-six votes. The Governor vetoed the bill. I take issue with the Governor's veto for many reasons. One of the reasons that he cited was that requirements of the bill would...sacrifice concepts and facts for clarity of punctuation and grammar. The bill speaks not at all to punctuation and grammar, only about proficiency in speaking the English language. It doesn't make sense to have classroom instructors who cannot speak the same language as the students they are instructing. It's a basic right not just of students to be able to have teachers they can understand but also of parents who many times foot the bill. The Governor has also cited several instances of individuals who would not be allowed under his interpretation of this bill to lecture in classrooms. I believe that his examples are spurious at best because these individuals would be allowed in the classrooms. The bill allows the standards to be set by each university system. Certainly, Henry Youngman and Victor Borge would be allowed to speak, there's no problem with that. Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski have a lot to offer, they're not precluded. Other instructors, however, who cannot speak the language would be required to either have an interpreter or not be allowed to speak in class. It doesn't do much good to have someone standing before a class of students and not being able to communicate with them in a language they can understand. That is the essence of this piece of legislation and that's why I'm moving for a vote to override the veto of this Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Channel 17 and Channels 25 have requested

permission to videotape the proceedings. Is leave granted?
Leave is granted. Discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I, frankly, don't think we're debating whether these instructors speak English or not. I happen to have some connection, an alumni of Northern and I was at a function we had there recently with Senator Welch. I was talking to some of the instructors and some of the students who were at my table about this problem, and...all of the instructors...and I recall when I went to school I had a lot of instructors who were foreign-born and they all spoke English. Now some of them spoke it with very heavy accents, some of them were very difficult to understand and that is what we're really talking about. I don't know any university system in the State that has non-English speaking teachers. It's the proficiency, it's the understandability or whatever phraseology you want to have. In any...initial debate last year I commented and I...I believe that my analogy, which I note had not been rejected although it was in the Veto Message so I will use it again, was that I've heard tapes of Albert Einstein, a very...heavy German accent, very difficult to understand, clearly one of the most brilliant men of this century; and I continue to argue that this bill would prevent Albert Einstein from being an instructor in one of our public universities. I think our universities have an obligation to see that our teachers are able to communicate and I think they by and large look up to it. I was intrigued at the resistance of my university faculty friends who are English-speaking, American-born citizens to this bill. They were very hostile about this, they felt this was not a good measure and that...fact that it worked against the betterment of our university system and was a slap in the face at any of our ethnic and foreign-born instructors who have made a major contribution. I think the Governor's veto is very much in

order. I commend him for having the courage to fly in the face of this jingoistic, if you will, piece of populace garbage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Further...further discussion? Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I don't think I've ever been accused of sponsoring or speaking for jingoistic legislation. I stood up and spoke in favor of this bill last spring. I did it with substantial and direct experience working with college students and teaching in the college classroom at a number of institutions across the State. Since this bill passed, I have had a chance to work with students, at least at the University of Illinois, I can give you the names of courses. Senator Schaffer, I wish it was as easy as you said it was. I wish it were simply the case of a few...faculty members who have some kind of difficulty getting their message through with English in a case of an accent here and there. It is much more than that, we are talking about teaching assistants. Teaching assistants who are hired by these universities for their expertise mainly in Math and Science, and that's where you find the grossest violations. In some case...cases that I can give you, the instructor cannot speak English. In one particular case where a group of students went to the university into the department and complained, the Department of Mathematics told thirty students, look, this is a math course, it deals in numbers and symbols, it's not important that English be the spoken word in that classroom. Well, I've heard from the parents of those students, today we heard from some students from Eastern Illinois University; I asked them, is this a problem in your school? They said not only it is a...is it a problem at the teaching assistant level but professors at the full associate and assistant level also in

some cases have this difficulty. I don't think this is a slap at anyone's heritage or ethnic derivation. I think it is an attempt to give people what they pay for. When you pay tuition, hard earned dollars and you put them down there on the line, I think that students and their parents have the right to be spoken to and lectured to in a classroom in English; English that makes sense and can be understood by the average student. In too many classrooms across this State that is not happening today. All this bill does is require those universities to set up oral proficiency exams. I don't know how we could oppose this, there's nothing jingoistic about it, it makes good sense. It's simply a vote for taxpayers and people who are paying those tuition bills. I urge an override of Senate Bill 1516.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The...the Chair would like to point out we've got a long way to go today, there's several lights on. Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I don't think probably there's a legislator on this Floor who hasn't been contacted by one of their constituents with respect to this issue. And, Senator Welch, I...I truly believe that...that your intent here from the very beginning was an honorable one and one that attempted to address some concerns that you have. Now, Senator Kustra, I would suggest to you that no matter what we do here today nothing is going to change, the problem is still going to be in place. There are no definitions, we don't know what oral proficiency really is. I would suggest that by calling attention to this problem, and we have done that both now and last spring, we will be making universities more aware of...of a problem that, yes, Senator Kustra, those who have paid their tuition expect to be understood, that they have a

right to be understood and...and...and...and learn from that instructor. That simply has to be done but this is...I view it a...an attempt to...to once again overregulate, overlegislate and, honest to goodness, folks, it's not going to do one single thing. The problem will still be there and I would urge opposition to this motion to override.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I rise in support of this bill. It's a very important issue in...I think in...in our society of having teachers coming to this land and not speaking English. We are not talking about people like Einstein that speak with an accent. We're talking about people being proficient in the English language. When I get a phone call from a particular teacher and the message is left and I call back on the phone and some lady in a foreign language answers says, wait, I'll get my daughter and then to find out that this is the instructor who's teaching students can't speak English on the telephone in an accent, I have to talk to her twelve-year-old daughter to...her to interpret, I don't think this is the type of teachers we...we should have. And I don't think anywhere in the world can an American go or an English-speaking person go and teach class in English and not in that language in that country unless there's an American institute or something there. But I know down in South America or...or Mexico, the teachers all speak Spanish and if you're an American student, you better learn that language. I know in Poland it's the same way, you better learn Polish if you want to go to a Polish university; otherwise, there's no teachers there to teach in English. So I...I rise in support of this bill and I think the Governor is completely wrong, and I think it's a necessary bill especially in...in our community and the ethnic community. We're not saying people that speak

with...accents are bad, we're saying people that don't speak at all shouldn't be teaching and that's what we have. I...ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I...I would like to comment to...to Senator Maitland. In his district there's a school that one of my constituents goes to that could not understand the instructor and my constituent happened to be my daughter, and everyone in the class had tremendous difficulty with that and it's a...it was a math class, very complicated one. And it just seems to me that we certainly ought to override this...piece of legislation...the Governor's veto.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 1516. I don't think it's any secret to anybody that the Governor from time to time makes mistakes, this veto was a mistake. What we are saying, Senator Maitland...we're not trying to overregulate, what we are establishing is the public policy of this State, and we are establishing the public policy on the...for the benefit of those who otherwise have nowhere else to go. What in the world is a college student to do with a teacher that he or she can't understand? If you complain too vocally, that same teacher is...got the opportunity to...to grade you accordingly, and so as a result, there are very few complaints, unfortunately, except to people like us. I think this makes eminently good sense, perhaps that's why everybody is afraid of it, it just makes...it's too logical; but I think as a

matter of public policy we ought to say to the students and to the parents who are paying for those students, we're going to give your son and daughter an opportunity at least to understand. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUIZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Welch may close. Senator Welch may close.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. Let me first start with the Einstein quote that I let go earlier in the spring without rebuttal. When Albert Einstein went to school in Germany, I'm sure that he had fluent German teachers; otherwise, he wouldn't have become as brilliant as he was, you know, he could have just ended up old Al Einstein, a garage mechanic, had he faced the same problems students in Illinois face. I think that that is a red herring, but let me just say during the past year we have made universities aware of this problem and it's about time they become aware of it. They should have been aware all along, but for them to say now that, well, we'll take care of it, leave us to our own device, the Legislature has pointed this out, this happened and has been happening for twenty years, this isn't a brand new problem that just came about in the last few years because of the Governor's trips to Japan to bring back economic development. This has gone on for years. And a few months ago I spoke to an instructor at Northern Illinois University who teaches English as a second language, and what she told me was that after my bill passed...her class contained very many classroom instructors who could not speak English, the day after the Governor vetoed this bill half the class dropped out. Those instructors recognized they don't speak English fluently, but when the bill was vetoed they thought they could get by with it again, they thought it would be a return to the status quo and that's something that the students and parents of students in

the State of Illinois can't afford. One of the interesting things during the last two months, a student came up to me who was very much in support of the English fluency bill and he was a blind student, and he said, Senator, I just cannot understand what these professors are saying. Being blind he couldn't read the professor's lips, he only could rely upon his hearing ability and he was having a great deal of trouble. Students are entitled to better than that, the State of Illinois is entitled to better than that and I think we in the Legislature must set the tone for what we teach in our colleges, and one of the basic rights of all students and all parents is that classroom instructors speak the same language as those students they are instructing. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1516 pass, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 43, the Nays are 11, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1516 having received the required constitutional three-fifths vote is declared passed. Page 13, bottom of page 13 is Senate Bill 2037. All right. Page 14, 1734, Senator D'Arco...Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

I'm not going to call that bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Okay.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

A point of personal privilege, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

SB 1738
Averie

On your desk you'll find a book called, "You Got To Want It" by Dick Void. He's the premier workout guy in Illinois. You didn't get your book? You didn't get a book either? All right, I got...I got some in the office, but you should read it. I think...especially the Republicans because after those dirty campaigns against us, you want to work out all that anxiety and frustration and this will help you do that, Pate, are you listening? This is good for you guys, so pay attention, read the book and start working out and you all will be in better shape including you, Aldo, remember that...don't hand...I don't want that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The...the...the question has been raised Senator D'Arco if you are not the ghost writer of this...this book. Senate Bill 1738, Senator Dudycz. Senator Dudycz on the Floor? Senate Bill 1738, Senator Hall. Senator Hall, do you wish to proceed?

SENATOR HALL:

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Page 14. All right, read the motion, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 4 line 22 through 32 of Senate Bill 1738 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Hall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. We are in the middle of page 14...or at the top of page 14, Senate Bill 1738, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Budget after veto the Governor eliminated all legislative add-ons and reduced each line item by three percent. Staffing that facilities would be below five percent, the department's original budget at the funding level. A two

percent reduction included in the March budget and at three percent reduction imposed by the Governor's budget shows the legislative initiative and projects vetoed by the Governor. It is important to note that the reorganization budget actually the '87...GRRF appropriations after...veto total only 575.4 million. The executive request budget address community grant cuts the Governor backed off on part of his community cuts by restoring the three percent cut and adding an extra one cent...percent cost of living increase to bring the COLA levels up to two percent or...and so what is needed at this time is that there's just simply not enough money for these people to operate. So I would ask your most favorable support in overriding the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1738.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? If we could have...keep the noise level down, we could conclude our business much more quickly and more promptly. Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Just a...a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

The Governor did restore the cuts for the community mental health, right? And so that's not included in this veto, right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

You're right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, at some point, I think we should talk about the

restorations that have been made or will be made by supplemental appropriation in the DMHDD budget. I know that Representative Young and Senator Hall are very sincere in this request, but I would suggest that...that the add-backs that have already been agreed to are probably as far as we can go at this point. We begin again in January and I think a new program such as this should probably be considered then. I think we all know it can't get off the ground and...while I particularly admire Representative Young and Senator Hall's dedication to this problem, I think we'd be well-advised to not override at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREGE:

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in opposition to this motion. I would just point out that this is an add-on to the department's budget. It is an...item which the department itself did not think was sufficiently high in priority to warrant inclusion in the budget. I'd suggest that we're having a hard enough time paying for the cost of the mental health services that have been identified as a high priority. So I would ask that you reject this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Hall may close.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Governor did make some restorations and even the department may say but from the people who are...are affected by this are telling us today that still the restoration wasn't enough, and you know what a problem we have here today with all these different agencies and with cuts. I simply want you to do the humane thing to see with all the money that we have around here and when it comes to something that has to do with the little people, it

seems all of a sudden that we cannot find the money. This is a worthwhile project and it certainly should have remained as we passed it out originally. I would ask that you would give a most favorable support to this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. The question is, shall the...shall the item on page 4 lines 20 through...22 through 32 of Senate Bill 1738 pass the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 26, none voting Present. The item on page 4 lines...22 through 32 of Senate Bill 1738 having failed to receive the required three-fifths vote is declared lost. Senator Hall, do you wish to proceed on 1751? 1752, Senator Leitch. Senator Leitch on the Floor? All right. The middle of page 14 is Senate Bill 1752, the motions...Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 11 and 12, lines 35 and 1 through 6 of Senate Bill 1752 Do Pass the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Leitch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Leitch.

SENATOR LEITCH:

Thank you, very much, ladies and gentlemen. This is not a budget buster. This is a fifty thousand dollar amount that is urgently needed to help us in the central Illinois area to get a handle on implementing a program to deal with the sultation problem of Peoria Lake and the Illinois River. It enjoys bipartisan support. I don't know why in the world it was vetoed to begin with. We started out asking for a hun-

dred and then cut it back to a fifty thousand dollar number, and as a retiring member, I would very much appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 11 line 35 and the item on page 12 lines 1 through 6 of Senate Bill 1752 pass, the...the...the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 6, none voting Present. The item on page 11 line 35 and the item on page 12 lines 1 through 6 of Senate Bill 1752 having received the required three-fifths vote is declared passed. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Request a verification of the affirmative roll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

All right. There's been a request for a verification of the affirmative vote. Members will be in their seats. The Secretary will read those who voted in the affirmative. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

The following voted in the affirmative: Barkhausen. Alexander. D'Arco. Davidson. DeAngelis. Dagnan. Dudycz. Fawell. Friedland. Geo-Karis. Holmberg. Jones. Jeremiah Joyce. Karpel. Keats. Kelly. Kustra. Lechowicz. Leitch. Lemke. Mahar. Maitland. Nedza. O'Daniel. Poshard. Rigney. Rupp. Savickas. Schaffer. Schuneman. Smith. Sommer. Topinka. Watson. Welch. Woodyard. Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Senator Rock, do you question the presence of any member who voted in the affirmative? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator Friedland.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is Senator Friedland on the Floor? Senator Friedland on the Floor? Strike his name. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator Savickas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Savickas on the Floor? Senator Savickas on the Floor? Strike his name.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is Senator Jones on the Floor? Senator Jones on the Floor? Strike his name. Senator Rock. All right. Mr. Secretary. On that...on that question, the Ayes are 34, the Nays are 6, none voting Present. The item on page 11 through...line 35 and the item on pages 12 lines 1 through 6 of Senate Bill 1752 having failed to receive the required three-fifths vote is declared lost. 1753, Senator Mahar...1753, Senator Poshard. On...Mr. Secretary, Senate Bill 1753, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 16 lines 32 through 35 of Senate Bill 1753 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Poshard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the Environmental Protection Agency bill. The particular line item deals with additional work on the sewer systems in Herrin, a town in my district that supports about three major industries. A lot of people from all

over my area work in those industries and this 1.2 million dollar override would help Herrin complete their sewer systems to support these industries and keep the jobs in our area. I'd ask for affirmative vote here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

A quick question, if you would add a few more in, you got a lot of friends who wouldn't mind helping you out if you'd add more than one sewer in there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 16 lines 32 through 35 of Senate Bill 1753 pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 25, none voting Present. The item on page 16 lines 32 through 35 of Senate Bill 1753 having failed to receive the required three-fifths vote is declared lost...the next order of business, Senate Bill 1753. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 17 lines 10 through 14 of Senate Bill...1753 Do Pass the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator O'Daniel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. This amendment appropriates three million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars in the General Revenue Fund to the...from the General Revenue Fund to the Environmental Protection

Agency for the purpose of making a grant to renovate and upgrade the water and waste water treatment plant in the City of Effingham. The...their present plant is operating at full capacity and until it is upgraded there will be no new industry locate there and no expansion of...of present industries, and there is a lot of industry showing...interest in locating in...in Effingham County. The community has one of the better transportation systems in...in downstate Illinois, and I feel that if we can appropriate money for golf courses and marinas on Lake Michigan and all, we should be able to find some funds for our infrastructure in downstate Illinois and I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 17 lines 10 through 14 of Senate Bill 1753 pass the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 28, the Nays are 26, none voting Present. The item on page 17...page 17 lines 10 through 14 of Senate Bill 1753 having failed to receive the required three-fifths vote is declared lost. All right. With leave of the Body, we will...all right,...with leave of the Body, we will return to the top of page 14, motions in writing, override item vetoes. Senator Dudycz was off the Floor. Senate Bill 1738, Mr. Secretary. Whose motion is that, Mr. Secretary? All right, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 2 line 33 through 35 to Senate Bill 1738 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Dudycz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Is that Senator Dudycz and...and Carroll? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCYZ:

...yes, thank you, Mr. President. I request leave the Body to add Senator Carroll as a hyphenated cosponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Is leave granted to add Senator Carroll as a hyphenated cosponsor of the motion? Leave is granted. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCYZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. The requested funds for this item were requested to make structural changes at the new Horizon Center for the developmentally disabled in Chicago. Now these changes would include enlarging doorways, washrooms and classrooms for wheelchair-bound students, the...the multiply handicapped students so that they may have full access to all programs and facilities...in the center. Right...right now there are currently fifty-four multiply handicapped students at the new Horizon Center and their ages range from three to thirty-one and many of them are wheelchair-bound. I strongly urge the members especially those on...on this side of the aisle to vote for the restoration of these funds and I'd like to defer to Senator Carroll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have cosponsored Senator Dudycz's request that the monies, the Governor's item veto to the contrary notwithstanding that we override that item veto. I believe the Governor also is in error in this limited amount. This is capital necessary for severely handicapped to allow a joinder of the various buildings so that in fact these adolescents

can move around the facility and, therefore, enhance their ability to be trained, to be educated, to be...rehabilitated. I don't believe he understood the need and necessity for this three hundred thousand dollar capital improvement and, therefore, join Senator Dudycz in this request.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Further discussion? Senator Dudycz, do you wish to close? The question is, shall the item on page 2 lines 33 through 35 of Senate Bill 738...1738 pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, 1 voting Present. The item on page 2 lines 33 through 35 of Senate Bill 1738 having received the required three-fifths vote is declared passed. (Machine cutoff)...Carroll, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR CARROLL:

By way of explanation, if I could, Mr. President, members have asked. I had filed several motions on this same bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...well...wait a minute...hold on a second. Senator Carroll, just give us a moment.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...

SENATOR CARROLL:

...it's a commentary to explain why we are not calling the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator...Senator Carroll for his commentary.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you. The...several items that the Governor had

vetoed in the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities have been a concern of the majority of the members of the Senate, mainly those that would have kept three of the institutions certified and open by having an appropriate staff/patient ratio which the bill as signed by the Governor would not have had and also to provide the necessary funding for the not-for-profit agencies that do the rehabilitation and training. We have been in negotiations with the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disability and with the Office of the Governor and the Bureau of the Budget and believe that we have reached an agreement that will, in fact, keep those institutions open and provide the necessary funds basically beginning January 1st for those providers of care. That will be handled in a supplemental appropriation that we will deal with during the December Session; and, therefore, rather than attempt to override or successfully override the veto of the Governor which was based on full year funding, everyone involved felt it was smarter to negotiate a compromise that in fact would be released and spent, so we will not be calling the motion so that we can then effectively deal with it by way of agreement of all parties during the supplemental process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

So, Senator Carroll, it's my understanding then that you will not be calling any motions on...

SENATOR CARROLL:

1738.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...on 1738 on the order of...of business of restoration, is that correct?

SENATOR CARROLL:

That is correct, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, just to alert the members that...we are going to

the item...reductions. We will begin on the middle of page 15 with Senator Welch. Senator Welch, when...when we get there, just a moment, we have a technical problem here. Senator Jeremiah Joyce, for what purpose do you arise?...Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. President. If we have filed a motion but it is not on the Calendar, is it the intention of the Chair to go to that matter...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

It's...it's my understanding that any motion that has been filed will in fact be called even though it has not...hasn't been printed or distributed. Senator Rock. All right. We are now ready to...to proceed...we will be going to page 15, middle of the page, restoration, Senate Bill 1749, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 17 line 33 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Welch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Welch. Senator Welch. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Should I proceed with this override?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

At your pleasure.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this override cut one million five hundred forty-nine thousand six hundred dollars in general revenue funds from the Department of Children and Family Services. In particular, the provisions that were cut dealt with prevention services of...or community services, programs which organize community

self-help groups for delinquency prevention and neighborhood development using the model of the youth service pioneered by a Clifford Shaw and the Chicago area project. Funding for this community service program is supplemental by the self-help efforts of neighborhood residents both by the working as volunteers and...in raising local and private funds. If we do not override this veto what will happen is that the...Community Services line for the department's budget will be left at only six-one hundredths of a percent greater than what we spent in 1986, and I think that that would be a tragedy, and I would move for an affirmative vote to override the veto of the Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 17 line 33 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all...have all voted who wish? We would ask our guests in the gallery to please refrain from any applause. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The item on page 17 line 33 of Senate Bill 1749 having received the required majority of Senators elected is declared restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. All right. On the Order of Senate Bill 1749, Mr. Secretary, read the...additional motion that's filed.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 18 line 4 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Welch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Could we...could we have some order, please.

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This line item would override and restore one million six hundred eight-five thousand seven hundred dollars to the Comprehensive Community Based Service to Youth Grant line item for the Department of Children and Family Services, bringing it to...as passed by the General Assembly level of seven million six hundred ninety-one thousand and three hundred dollars. If we do not pass this, we will end up with seven-tenths of a percent less than we spent in Fiscal Year 1986. Most of the people here, as you can already gather, are here on behalf of this bill and urge support for this override for this restoration of money...from the Governor's veto and I would move that we restore those funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 18 line 4 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored...I beg your pardon, Senator DeAngelis, I did not see your light. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a point of clarification. Senator Welch, what...what monies are these, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

The general revenue funds, the Governor cut the budget for this line item from...he cut money that I had added in a supplemental amendment back in the spring, that was cut out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I...I know it's...it's...that's what it is, but what's the purpose of the money? That's what I'd like to

know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

The purpose of this particular item is for diversion services, comprehensive community...based youth services program, supporting the development of community based youth service networks which provide a variety of services to trouble youth. In particular, they include crisis intervention, counseling, shelter care and other programs to design to reunite families. These programs provide a network of youth services throughout the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Sorry for asking again. What...I thought the previous item was that line item.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

The previous line item was for prevention services which included community self-help groups organizing for delinquency prevention and neighborhood development. It's a different line item of the budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

And how much is this one for?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

This one is one million six hundred eight-five thousand seven hundred dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator...Senator Fawell. Senator Mahar...did you...Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Are you talking about...is this the money for the fifteen hundred boards, is that what you're talking about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, it is, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

And...and the money before that also went to the fifteen hundred boards?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No, that was a different line item and a different group of individuals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Where did the three million dollars go if it's not to the fifteen hundred boards?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

(Machine cutoff)...Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Let me try to explain the difference, if I can, Senator. The first item that we just passed is based on a as requested source of funding. As agencies...groups request this money

from the State they are funded. The second line is the fifteen hundred boards that you refer to, those go direct to those boards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Senator...Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So this is actually more for the administration of the fifteen hundred boards, is that...is that where it's going?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

No, it's...it's not administration. It's basically for increased services for crisis intervention, counseling, shelter care, those items. It's not administrative.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Channel...Channel 20 has sought permission to tape the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any further discussion? Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think as a matter of helping to clarify the situation here and specifically the question that was just posed by Senator Fawell, this is an unbudgeted add-on. This was not an item which was included in the department's original budget and I think everyone should be clear on that point. I would ask for a No vote on this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Welch may close.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I would urge that the members read a document that was placed on their desk recently by Gordon Johnson, the director of the Department of Children and Family Services, titled "The Governor's Task

Force on Homeless Youth." The result of this task force study was that they found that significantly lacking are emergency shelter, especially for pregnant teens; employment and education assistants, outreach drop-in centers, access to medical treatment and independent living programs. The report went on to say the youth service system provides an insufficient array of services for homeless youth under eighteen years of age and hardly any help for young adults eighteen through twenty. The recommendation of the department was to go on and create funding through legislation for implementing this program and all of the requirements. The director who in the spring said he had other priorities for that same money that I added to the budget now comes out with this task force report which, in fact, supplements my request for that money to be added to the budget. He has in fact proved my case with the report that you have sitting on your...on your desks, and I would urge a favorable vote on this restoration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

The question is, shall the item on page 18 line 4 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored, the item reduction to the...of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 33, the Nays are 2, none voting Present. The item on page 18 line 4 of Senate Bill 1749 having received the required majority vote of Senators elected is declared restored, the item reduction of the...the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. On the Order of...motion filed...another motion filed with respect to Senate Bill 1749, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 18 line 6 of Senate Bill

1749 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Welch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This particular line item would override and restore one million thirty-five thousand four hundred dollars in general revenue funds to the Unified Delinquency Intervention Services Grant line bringing it to its...as passed by the General Assembly level of two million one hundred eight-one thousand two hundred dollars. The unified delinquency...intervention service is an alternative to incarceration which in effect saves the State money. This...this UDIS program serves as a last resort program to keep twice adjudicated delinquents out of the Department of Corrections. The program provides in-home counseling and job training to these youths. Services provided to youth in this category costs approximately six thousand dollars a year under this program while the Department of Corrections incarceration costs an average of over twenty-five thousand dollars per year for each youth, a savings to the taxpayers of a great amount of money, and I would urge that we restore this money to the budget of the Department of Children and Family Services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 18 line 6 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 24, none voting Present. The item on page 18 line 6 of Senate Bill 1749 having failed to receive

the...the required majority vote of Senators elected is declared lost. Senate Bill 1749, Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 18 line 11 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Hall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

The Chicago...pardon me, Senator Hall. The Chicago Area Project request permission to film from the gallery. Is permission granted? Permission is granted. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This motion to override that I have filed is for the Department of Children and Family Services '87 budget. It involves the line for Independent Living Skills Grants Program on page 18 line 11. The override would restore only three hundred and eighty-three thousand dollars of the GRF to this line, bringing it to as passed by this General Assembly to the level of six hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars of the Governor's veto. Now this was to eliminate an add-one sponsored by Senator Welch and the balance was to impose a three percent cut. The program is targeted to homeless youth age twenty and under to provide service to facilitate their living independently. This is a well-deserved...and this is something that all of us should support. I ask your most favorable support of this Senate Bill 1749 amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

All right. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 18 line 11 of Senate Bill 1749 be restored the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 28, none voting Present. The item on page 18 line 11 of Senate Bill 1749 having failed to receive the required majority vote of Senators elected is declared lost. Page 16, Senator Hall, do you wish to proceed on that motion?

SENATOR HALL:

No, hold it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. On page 16, we'll now move to the motions in writing to accept the specific recommendation of...for change, Senate Bill 1951. Senator Holmberg, are you ready to proceed? All right. Mr. Secretary, the motion with respect to Senate Bill 1951. Read the motion.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SECRETARY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1951 in the manner and form as follows. Signed, Senator Holmberg.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Yes, the amendatory veto of Senate Bill 1951 which was a bill passed to allow Rockford which had lost its home rule powers to go to referendum for a possible sales tax increase for repairing infrastructure, the veto merely makes technical corrections suggested by the Department of Revenue to make it easier for them to assist the city in its collection process and puts it in line with already collected taxes that the Department of Revenue is taking care of. This specifically affects Rockford, and I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1951 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Holmberg. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Yeas are 53, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1951 having received the required constitutional majority vote of Senators elected are declared accepted. Senator Poshard. On the Order of Motions in Writing to Accept the Specific Recom-

mendations for Change, there's a motion filed with respect to Senate Bill 2-2-5-5. 2255, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I...I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2255 in the manner and form as follows. Signed, Senator Poshard.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the Rural Economic Development Act. It's a multifaceted Economic Development Act for the rural communities of the State. There was much discussion and debate with the members of the Governor's Office over the specific parts of the bill and I think we arrived at a reasonable compromise. I know that's in your analysis and if there are specific questions about any part of it, I'll be happy to answer them; otherwise, I would move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Just one question, Senator Poshard. Is there very much left of the bill once the Governor got through rewriting it to suit his own purposes?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Yes, I...I think there's quite a bit left of it. Many of the major things in the crop diversification and vertical integration loan programs, much of that money has already been taken up; the Regional Correctional Facilities Act which will be implemented in January. Other things which pertain specifically to rural Illinois are in there, so we were

pleased with what we were able to come out with.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2255 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Poshard. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2255 having received the required constitutional majority vote of Senators elected are declared accepted. All right, with leave of the Body, we'll move back to the Calendar. Any motions that have been filed will be taken up before the close of business today, Mr. Secretary, so let's...we'll...we'll move through the Calendar and deal with those matters that the members wish to and then we'll go back to the Order of Motions...(machine cut-off)...turn to page 2 on the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1699. Senator Carroll has sought leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1699, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This, as I think we all know, is the amendment we briefly discussed yesterday which would be the comprehensive health insurance plan. Let me just say by way of thanks and procedure, as you will recall, in June we amended our rules

so that we could hear this bill now. We amended it by creating a task force and panel to review this very complicated procedure of what should be within and how should we pay for a comprehensive insurance plan that would, in fact, allow insurance to be paid for by those who are currently unable to receive it because of a...an existing or preexisting condition, whether that condition be heart, diabetes, kidney dialysis or some crippling disease or others. As part of that, Senator DeAngelis, Kustra, Berman, Jones and Dawson joined with me in chairing subcommittees on different parts of this issue, subcommittees to which we invited in members of the insurance industry, the consumer industry and anyone else we could find who had demonstrated an interest on any side of this issue. Each of those subcommittees met over the summer and fall and made recommendations back to the full panel, which recommendations were then incorporated into the amendment that is now before you. This amendment, we believe, addresses the need of Illinois to allow people to afford with dignity the opportunity to acquire, to buy, to pay for comprehensive health insurance. It'll allow these people no longer to go bankrupt in order to maintain their health. Twenty-two percent of the bankruptcies filed in Illinois in 1985 were the result of the soaring hospital and health care costs that we allow to take place. Let me say that we have established a mechanism for funding that I think is appropriate and adequate. We have provided that the rate shall be one hundred thirty-five percent of the standard or individual rate that is currently being charged in Illinois. Those funds will be into a pool that will then be administered and pay claims against the fund. We have the normal six-month waiting, another detail that I am willing to go into but I think you all have a packet of information about the content. We have delayed the effective date of the law till July 1, so that the Governor will then appoint the panel

of industry and consumer to create the mechanism by which to administer the plan, and then six months later the plan would go in effect which will be the first day of January of 1988. Our experience in the eleven states that have already enjoyed the benefits of this type of plan tell us that with a hundred and thirty-five percent of standard rate base there should be no loss to the plan for several years out. Then, there is the possibility that the income into the plan will be less than the outgo, and we have provided that were that to happen, general revenue funds of the State of Illinois would make up that shortfall. We strongly believe that the setoff, the transfer, the savings in public aid and in aging will more than account for that shortfall, and let me give you an example. A person today who is on a MANG-type plan, who is medically indigent but capable of working is required to spend down to a level in order to get coverage from public aid; coverage they are now getting that we, the taxpayers of Illinois, are paying for. That same person would be allowed to buy the insurance as part of the spenddown and get off of the MANG program, become gainfully employed because now they would have insurance, start paying taxes again to the State and not using public aid monies to pay for this insurance coverage, the actual bills to the hospitals and doctors and clinics and other type of services needed. Those savings have been estimated to be greater than the projected shortfall. We also know on the Federal level there is legislation pending that says every employer who does not join a state plan and pay into a state plan would lose their Federal tax credit, currently ten percent, by not joining a state plan. That law is pending in Congress with strong support from the insurance industry, small business and others in an attempt to get it passed. With three billion dollars of premium being written in Illinois today, that ten percent credit or three hundred million would be much greater than any

potential deficit in the plan. So, were that to pass in a Congressional session, then we would have the opportunity to assist the businesses of Illinois by then allowing them to ask for an assessment into this pool which would be much less than what they would lose if we had not created the pool. With that, Mr. President, to explain the amendment...I believe is sufficient and we'll have other comment from...on passage stage and I would be willing to answer any questions. I would offer Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1699.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1699. Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Some questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator Carroll, the...the last time we saw this bill the funding mechanism was to be provided by insurance companies doing business in the United States and...or in the State of Illinois, and, of course, the concern was that that...the cost would simply be loaded on to private insurance buyers. Now the funding mechanism has been changed in this, has it not?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

The basic funding mechanism has always been the premium paid by the insured. There is...there was in an earlier draft an assessment on the insurance companies for any shortfall. As compared to the premium dollar paid, the shortfall, if ever, is a small percentage; and, yes, we have changed where that shortfall would come from, as I explained earlier.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

So the basic funding mechanism, Senator, is...is going to be the premiums paid by people buying these policies, is that correct?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

That is correct and let me just add...to be clear, Senator Schuneman, that even before...part of the funding even under the earlier versions, which were versions for discussion purposes and for the subcommittees to work from, had a tax credit in there of State taxes anyway so there was always a general revenue backup.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

So then I assume that you, as the sponsor of the bill, and the...the Attorney General and others are committed to the idea that whatever shortfall there may be will be funded out of general revenue as opposed to loading it off onto the insurance community or the business community. I'm...I'm thinking in terms of this bill going back and forth between the two Chambers and wondering if this is a commitment on your part to fund it this way...so a simple yes or no answer, I guess.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

I'm sorry, maybe my comments before were confusing. Absolutely. It is the intent of this sponsor and the other members that this be the funding mechanism. My other comments were related to three, four or five years from now if Congress changes the game and they...and the business com-

munity asks us to assess them so that they can save some money by being in this pool, then three, four or five years from now we will look for that. As this is going through the General Assembly, we are committed to the general revenue funding. Were the House to tinker with that, it will be in conference, our votes will be there to have the general revenue backup.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I have several concerns about the way the bill is written and...and let me preface this by saying, I think you're...I think you're doing something worthwhile here and...and I...I don't want to be an obstructionist because I think there are people who need this program. My concern, however, is that the program may be a little broader than we can afford and also there...there is no cap on what the State might be required to pay. One of the things I notice, if my...if my analysis is correct, is that contrary to...to most insurance plans, there's no limit of any kind on mental treatment and psychiatric treatment. Now it's a common practice in...in most group policies and...and most private policies that there is some kind of limit on that exposure. I see no such limit here and I'm concerned about people who, frankly, get hooked on psychiatrists and simply stay hooked on them.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

There's been some very specific changes from the earlier drafts, Senator Schuneman. There is, in fact, a limit on the mental health portion in the final draft that's before you...in what's actually Amendment No. 1. There's a forty-five-day limitation on in-patient coverage, there is a...basically a sixty-four dollar chargeable against the

policy limit on an out-patient basis, eighty percent of...of eighty dollars. It is, therefore, limited and there are other limits within the plan as well that deal not just with mental health but with...what you can, in fact, charge against the plan.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

As I understand the...the valuations...the actuarial figures that have gone into this, they're now projecting that at a rate of a hundred and thirty-five percent, there will be some twenty-three thousand participants in the plan. Is...is that right? Are your figures based on...on those numbers?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Two things. Senator Schuneman, first on the last question, let me refer you to page 12, section 16, "The first fifty percent of professional out-patient visits for diagnostic and treatment of mental and emotionally disordered rendered up to a maximum." Okay? Secondly, page 12, item 16...secondly, yes...let me say...no one knows yet, but economic and fiscal did a projection that said by 1992...92-93...Fiscal Year '92, there could be twenty-two thousand eight hundred.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I think that...we probably had sufficient debate here and I have some amendments that follow that I...I hope the members will pay some attention because this seems to be an idea which whose time has come but I think we ought to be a little bit careful about what we're enacting here today in that we don't adopt a pro-

gram that's richer than we can afford.

PRESIDENT:

I'm sorry. Senator Schuneman, have you concluded? All right, further discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor...Senator Carroll. Senator Carroll. Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Senator Carroll, in a previous session of this Legislature, I attempted to pass a piece of legislation which would have allowed handicapped children with preexisting injuries and illnesses to be adopted by families who really wish to adopt them but they were prevented from obtaining insurance. What has happened and many organizations have reported this to me is that those children then remain on the public aid rolls, remain in orphanages and are not part of many of our Illinois families. Would this piece of legislation take care of that particular concern on their part?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Absolutely.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Any further discussion? If not, Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1699. If there's no further discussion, all in favor of Amendment No. 1 indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 provides that there will be a limit on the amount of money that the State will put into this plan. Frankly, Senator, I'm not at all comfortable with the numbers that we have seen and I would like to see some kind of cap put into the bill. Now, I apologize to you because I'm sure you're wondering where the amendments are and, frankly, they got here about two minutes ago and so...we should furnish you with a copy of these amendments. Do you...you don't have one probably now.

PRESIDENT:

Mr...Mr. Secretary, will you read the amendment?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2.

(Secretary reads Amendment No. 2)

And all...the other two amendments are likewise except for seventy-five and one hundred percent.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

So, basically, what the...what the amendment says, Senator, is that if the numbers are right and if we're going to have twenty-three thousand people included in this system and they're going to pay premiums of about twenty-five million dollars which...which is the way it calculates, then if the total cost and claims paid out amount to, say, thirty-seven million dollars, then the State is going to pick up half of the premiums paid. Now you just said a few minutes ago that this plan is intended to be self-supporting and that it's intended that the premiums are going to pay the cost, and all this amendment says is that if you're wrong, then we're going to put a limit on what the State will pay. The...the limit will be fifty percent over and above what the premiums are.

That's what the State's cost would be.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1699. Discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President...I will rise in opposition to this and the next two amendments that are an effort to allegedly put a cap on the amount of expenditures of general revenue dollars and let me explain why. You know, we went through this in other areas of health care costs where most people...Senator Schuneman and others, were diametrically opposed to caps. Suddenly caps sound good. I don't understand the dichotomy, but let me say more. Here's the real issue. Yes, this is new. Yes, we have no experience factor. Yes, we are basing this on projections by our prognosticating agency, economic and fiscal, and, yes, we have no idea whether they're right or wrong. We surely don't want to hamstring ourselves now for something that may happen, may happen, may happen three, four or five years out. We have no idea of knowing but we'll be here and were that to happen, this like anything else, two things will happen; one, we can always amend it and, two, it is still subject to annual appropriation of the General Assembly. We have the power year in and year out to appropriate or not appropriate and were it to get out of hand, we would have...we could, A, amend the law on the substantive or, B, just deal with it by appropriation; but more importantly...more importantly, I believe, Senator Schuneman, if you want it to work, this kills it. If you want it to be available to people, this assures you that the panel cannot set a rate with any level of comfort that an administrator would administer that people could buy into and pay premiums for because they don't know if it's going to be available the next year for something

over which we have no knowledge or control, and let me give you an example. What if, for example, the savings in public aid are greater than the potential deficit? If we could track dollar for dollar what we are not spending in taxes for public aid recipients now who would not be public aid recipients when CHIP passes because they can...instead of having a spenddown, they can buy the policy and go back to work, people who are no longer mobile because of job discrimination because of a handicap or a kidney dialysis or a heart condition or cancer or arthritis or whatever, those dollars we can't track, but those are general revenue dollars we're paying now that could be greater, significantly greater than the cap you're placing on this. My point is that within our fiscal budget today, were this five years from now, it could be a total wash, and we believe it will be. It doesn't mean we won't be funding the deficit, we will, but we won't be funding public aid. It'll be a wash, a transfer but done in the budgetary process. So, to put a limit on it now says to these people, stay on public aid. It also says the following. If we are correct, as all believe, that there will be Federal legislation that allows industry into our pool, every employer of Illinois will save significant dollars by contributing into this pool that you will not allow under this type of a cap and therefore they will lose their ten percent tax credit, hundreds of millions of dollars, because they cannot buy into this pool because we have capped it, through one form or another an unacceptable approach. I think it's silly now to even...be discussing it. We know it's a couple of years out. We have a delayed effective date and most important of all, we have created a panel that will be the oversight of this pool made up of industry representatives appointed by the Governor, other representatives appointed by the Governor and they will report back to us; and if we find at that time that this is getting out of hand, they will, in

fact, say to us, place some kind of limitation on. There will also be members of the General Assembly who will be oversighting this. So, as we gather an experience factor, that's the time to deal with it, not now, and I would oppose the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1699. A number of members have indicated their desire to be heard. In the meantime, a Mr. David Pasoli has asked leave to take some pictures from the gallery. Without objection, leave is granted. Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I am a principal cosponsor of this bill and have been for some time. I had another bill similar to this one which was eventually merged into this piece of legislation. I intend to vote for this bill on 3rd reading. About the only thing that I can agree with Senator Carroll on regarding his previous comments is the fact that, yes, this is a new program; yes, it's a new experience; yes, we are charting new ground. It seems to me that when we in this General Assembly embark on a brand new program, generally speaking, we try to start out modestly. We try to start out in a fashion that we can feel our way along and see if a program works and then later expand it. What Senator Schuneman is proposing here is a reasonable amendment to a good program. What I'm afraid of is that if we do not adopt Senator Schuneman's amendment and if this program does get out of hand and if the General Revenue Fund finds a much more significant drain on it because of this program than what is estimated that a good number of those people that we are promising assistance to today will not be served that way either, and so what we ought to remember is that this program was never offered as a guarantee to every last uninsurable in the State of Illinois

that they would have insurance. This insurance is going to cost, ladies and gentlemen, it's going to cost a lot and for us to say no more than...it cannot cost the State of Illinois more than half of the whole program, it seems to me is a very reasonable proposition. If we want this program to work in the long-run, then we'll back up and take a small step now by the adoption of Senator Schuneman's amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank...thank you, Mr. President. Like many of my fellow members over here, I'm looking for an excuse to support the bill and while the program is an excellent idea and the funding sources we're discussing, we've cleaned up all of that, but this program is about to have the same problem that so much of the great society legislation has. We're going to promise everything...either we're going to fund it and take care of it and then, as Senator Carroll is mentioning, a couple of years down the road we may discover, whoops, we can't afford that and at that point we will then cut back and we will leave the people going, wait a minute, you promised but now you're not doing it. With an amendment such as this that sets at least a reasonable limit to talk about, people realize, wait, this is not an unlimited program, there are certain parameters within which we have to work. We don't allow anybody to inflate the various rates here and there. This sets a workable limit people can look at and say, I've been promised this much and then we can...look at this and say we can probably deliver this amount. One of the great mistakes we make on major social programs is we say we're going to do everything and then years later we discover we can't and it ends up not working and then we've made a fool of ourselves again by over promising. That's the point of this amendment to at least put reasonable limits. We've got

several years before this program takes effect. Remember, this program does not take effect next 1 January, it's a couple of years down the road. As we start to get the experience, we may decide the fifty percent is...is wrong. We might want to say forty percent, we might say sixty percent, but if you set a limit in now knowing that we've got a couple of years potentially to change it, we have set a reasonable limitation, people know we're reviewing the program, know we're trying to promise something we can deliver, that's what this limit does and I think with the amount of time we have to perhaps change in the future, we might be able to pinpoint a little more closely the exact amount, but at least now, we haven't promised the sun and delivered very little.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment, but I have a question of the sponsor first.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

If the losses exceed fifty percent of the premium paid, what happens to the program?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, if...if we're going to operate an insurance program in the State of Illinois, we do what any other insurance company operation does and that is design a program and design premiums within a framework that we can afford. Now, I don't think it's going to be very difficult for people with insurance expertise to design a program on which their losses

can run up to as much of...as a hundred and fifty percent. Most insurance programs are designed with the idea that...that the total cost of operating the insurance program would be about ninety-eight percent of the premiums. What we're saying here is that...that the total costs...including claims and operating expenses could be as much as a hundred and fifty percent. I think that, in fact, adoption of this kind of an amendment now gives a good guideline to the people that are going to be designing the program.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I assume that your answer then is that the...you would reflect that at a higher premium cost.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, that's part of it and I think another part of it might be to look at some of the benefit...benefits that are provided under the program.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I read the amendment and I would like to support it because I would not like to see the State paying any more money than it should. However, when you look at the workability of it and...and it is...I...I saw it rather quickly 'cause I don't have a copy of it, it's a two line amendment, but I don't know whether you would do this retroactively, prospectively when you make the determination. For instance, are you going to take the...the premiums on a cumulatively basis? You have much more insurance expertise than I have, but you know there's a collection period before any premiums are paid. Are you going to do this by fiscal

year or by quarter or by what period? I mean, I...your attention is very good. The difficulty that I find is how do you implement it...and I don't know that you're going to make this group any more responsible by putting that in there because, hopefully...hopefully, we are going to select those people that administer this program that are responsible and we'll do everything in the way of cost containment and...so I mean...I don't really understand how you're going to implement it...that...and that is a question.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, it is my intent that the...the cap would be considered as an annual cap. That is the total premiums collected during a fiscal year or a calendar year would then be considered with the total losses of that year and that that's how the cap would be applied. Now you make a valid point in that you haven't had much time to look at this amendment, but I would make the point that...there's nobody on this Floor, aside from maybe a couple of people or three people, who've seen your amendment and I think this whole thing is being done too rapidly. We don't know for sure what we're doing and we ought to take a little time. We don't have to do this until next year.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, let me indicate my opposition a little further. I...I appreciate your trying to answer the questions on how you're going to implement it. The fact is that the loss experience in this area shows historically a much larger loss than fifty percent of the premium. Now...and the costs that are reflected by the Economic and Fiscal Commission reflect a loss ratio of about four hundred and fifty percent. So, we

know that in the event this cap is put on, the program would become unworkable because you also have the question of marketability. There is a point at which people will not buy insurance...cannot buy insurance and will then, in fact, go on the same system that we have right now. The question that was trying to be addressed with this bill is that we recognize a societal problem and as a societal problem, we feel that the risk ought to be spread across society rather than be targeted to the insurance companies or the small business person who would have to pay the additional costs either in government or in premiums to offset for the care that is currently being given and being paid for by others. I happen to serve on a hospital board and we are rather magnanimous in stating the amount of charitable work we do; however, we then turn around and adjust our rate base to reflect that generosity we've done the previous year by taking those costs of medical services that we have indicated as being charitable and raise the room rates and other costs to reflect that charity. I think if we're going to address the issue, we ought to do it and accept it as a societal problem, absolutely...absolutely try to control the cost, but I think this amendment might very well kill the bill because there are people up there who are going to, in fact, say, well, who is going to pick up the difference and those are the very same people we've trying to work with to reach an agreement, and I don't really want to resurrect that kind of opposition again.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion on Amendment No. 2? Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of Senator DeAngelis. I think you mentioned that economic-fiscal indicated that the loss ratio would be four hundred and fifty percent. Didn't you just say that, Senator? Why are we setting the premium at only one hundred and thirty-five percent? That would mean

that there's a difference between the one hundred and thirty-five and four hundred and fifty and that's a tremendous difference. We're not even looking realistically at the...at the problem. And the other figure that I question...we've heard that there will be twenty-three thousand people involved in this thing; yet...and I already showed this to the Attorney General. His last paragraph, the first page, says, "It's not only unfair but intolerable that 1.2 million Illinois citizens who incur a disability or a...disease through no fault of their own are denied insurance." Twenty-three thousand and this says 1.2 million. I think we deserve some...or some time anyway to work out that little difference and the little difference on the hundred and thirty-five and four hundred and fifty percent.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I want to address some of the comments and my friend, Senator Kustra, in particular as a co-sponsor of this bill. The problem with this amendment and the next two is that it doesn't make sense in relation to what we're trying to do at this time. This is not a social program that we're going to go in and build a building and we know the costs and we're going to say we're only going to spend two million dollars and we're going to bid a contract to bid...to build a two million dollar building. That's not this program. We're saying to people in Illinois that cannot get insurance that the State is going to stand behind and give you an insurance policy that you can walk into Dr. X's office and say, I need this service, here's my insurance policy, you're going to get paid by me or by the State of Illinois, here's my policy. That's this program. Now you either like that program or you don't like it, but this

amendment doesn't fit that program because if you like the program you cannot prospectively cap your exposure by saying how much you're going to spend. When you give that disabled person a policy, you're saying that if they pay the deductible and they pay the coinsurance, the State of Illinois is going to pay the bill. That's the promise that we're giving to them under this insurance policy, and if the costs of that policy exceed our projections, we can correct it prospectively, we'll change the policy in the future. You can't cap it by the appropriation process; otherwise, no doctor is going to serve that patient because they don't know whether the State of Illinois is going to stand behind and pay that service. That's the difference between putting a cap on the cost, what you're trying to do here, and putting a cap on the policy provision. Now, we've adopted in this amendment, the original amendment, a board, just like a board of directors of an insurance company, that will set the guidelines regarding the deductible, the coverage, the people that are entitled to the coverage, et cetera; and once that's set, any bill that's submitted under that program has to be paid. The credibility of the State of Illinois is behind that policy. If we don't like it, we can change it in the future, but you've got to stand behind our promise to pay when the policy is issued. That's why I've...I suggest to you that this amendment is not timely. This argument is not timely. In 1988, six months after the program is in force; 1989, a year after the program is in force, that's the time to look at the costs of this program; otherwise, nobody...nobody is going to honor this policy, nobody is going to provide the benefits that we're saying are going to be available to these disabled people because we're capping our exposure. You can't do that at the same time that you issue an insurance policy. Now, the sponsor of this bill...of this amendment is an expert, in my opinion, in the insurance business, and I

suggest to you that you can't issue an insurance policy and provide benefits and say, but if those benefits go beyond X dollars, we're not going to pay you. That's not the way insurance works. You've got to state in the policy what the benefits are, and in this policy, under Amendment 1, the benefits are stated. If we don't like it, change the policy benefits later on, but you can't cap through another method how much you're going to spend overall, and that's why I urge a No vote. If you vote Yes on this, you are, in fact, saying we don't want to give you the program. If you want to give them the program, you've got to vote No on this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong opposition to Amendment No. 2. You know what this reminds me of? This reminds me of the weatherization program for the poor and the utilities at that time were saying, listen, this program is going to cost us a hundred million dollars and even though it's a well-intentioned program, this thing is going to put us out of business. The fact is that after a year on that program, the utilities have bore the expense of about nine hundred thousand dollars throughout the entire State of Illinois. And this program reminds me of the same kind of logic that was used when they're talking about these tremendous shortfalls that everyone is going to experience. Number one, nobody knows what the shortfall is going to be, nobody can predict what the shortfall is. I don't care what economic and fiscal says. They don't know what the loss experience is going to be on this program. You've got people with preexisting conditions that are healthy individuals, that are going to...live long, healthy lives. You're not just talking about somebody that's terminally ill. You're talking about healthy human beings with preexisting condi-

tions who can't get jobs because they can't get insurance from their employer. Those are the people you're talking about here. Where's your sense of justice? Where's your sense of humanity? Don't scuttle this bill. This bill is important for all those people who are productive human beings and contribute to the economy of the State of Illinois. Vote against this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I note with interest that one of the figures I've seen, I think Senator Carroll used it in debate earlier, was projected twenty-three thousand people that would be in this program. Frankly, I think that...that figure dramatically understates the need and I...I think there is a real need. My guess is that there are a couple of thousand people in my legislative district alone. Now, I'm just talking about the people that have been through my office or the problems that I'm aware of. If you multiply that times fifty-nine, and figure they're figuring on...twenty-three thousand, this program could be four times as expensive as the proponents argue. Maybe it is a good expense. Maybe in the long-run we do save money, but...I don't see Senator Derman on the Floor. When is a good time to put a cap on a program if it isn't at the beginning? If this particular version of a cap is unworkable, what is a workable cap? Should there not be a ceiling? Should we sail into this thing? How many of you have even seen a copy of this thing? What, seven of us on the Floor have copies of it, have you ever seen it? We're going to vote on something that costs two hundred million dollars and casually reject even the concept of a cap? If this concept doesn't work, I say to the proponents, find us a concept that does so we know that we aren't mortgaging the future of all of our State programs, of education, of correc-

tions, of mental health. Let's find a workable cap if this isn't workable. We need to have some safeguards to see that this program however necessary or well-meaning doesn't sink everything else that this State has to do and it has that potential. If you don't have a...if you don't like this cap, what's a good cap?

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I obviously must take strong objection to the comments of Senator Schaffer, Senator Schuneman and others and maybe it's time for some better explanation because I think they have muddled and confused the issue, and I don't say they did so for any...reason, I think they are just confused. First of all, the amendment is inoperable, it's ineffective, there is no way of knowing what years you're talking about, it would not have the impact of a cap. That's beside the point. I think we are debating now the issue rather than the language of the amendment and it is a clever way to scuttle the program. It is a clever way to say we don't want a CHIP program, and let me tell you why. If we do not have the full faith and credit of a program to stand there, there won't be one. You cannot get anyone to provide services absent knowing that there'll be money there to pay it. If it gets, as Senator Schaffer suggests, out of hand, answer is simple, you've got a board there, change the coverage, change the deductibles, change the annual spending that's required, change the cap that's there on the amount you can recover under the program but you cannot change the funding source and have a policy. It would be the equivalent of Blue Cross when we had it saying and when you spend so much, I no longer pay the bills. Well, you might get coverage in January, February and March, but you better not get sick in October,

November or December because nobody is going to take care of you if the policy says we're not going to pay if you get sick in October, November or December. That is totally illogical. The other thing illogical in this approach now, absent the ability to go out and see what the experience is, and that's why the delayed effective date, what do we save in public aid expenses? Public aid thinks they're pretty significant. So do I. So do most others. We don't know and that is not factored in. Therefore, it means...sure there's a benefit to the State, it'll spend less dollars the year this goes into effect because we won't spend general revenue on it and we won't be spending on public aid, we think, and therefore, there won't be coverage and people will be uninsured or it will be so expensive to the State 'cause all we've done is taken them out of the pool and put them back on public aid or made them bankrupt first and then put them on public aid. That makes no sense. That is not economically sound for the citizens of Illinois or for our tax base. Since you haven't even put into this, what about public aid savings where it's a wash and no expense to the State, this is illogical. It's merely a way to say, you don't want a CHIP program. If you don't want it, vote against it. Don't try and scuttle it this way. I would urge defeat.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1699. Senator Schuneman may close.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. Wrong, Senator Carroll. Absolutely wrong. This is not an attempt to scuttle the bill. I recognized this probably before you did that there's a need out there for this sort of thing and I support the idea, but I also support the idea that the State not go broke paying for something that we can't afford to pay for. Now, no insurance would be available under this system until

January 1 of 1988. That's more than a year away. It's plenty of time to do the planning that needs to be done and the designing of a program that can be afforded by this State. The thing that I think...has been done here is to design a program which is probably richer than we can afford. Now, we've all heard all the horror stories about the claims that are going to come in under this plan, and I don't want to get into that issue right now because I think you all know what they are. The only thing I'm seeking to do by this amendment is to put a cap on what the State will spend, put it on now so that the people that design the plan will have some idea about the framework within which they will be operating. Now there are insurance actuaries all over the place who can give you credible information. I'm not sure...well, I think...I think economic and fiscal went to some insurance actuaries to get some of their information, but a...a program can be defined, can be devised, we can vote on this next year and all I'm saying to you now is that we ought to have some kind of a cap. Now, in your opening remarks, Senator, you told us that this...the basic funding for this plan is to come from the premiums that are paid, and all I'm saying is if you're wrong that the premiums won't support the plan, then let's limit the amount of what the State will pay to fifty percent of all the premiums that are taken in and I think that's a realistic approach, and I would ask for support of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1699. Those in favor of the amendment indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Roll call has been requested. Those in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 2 will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,

there are 20 Ayes, 30 Nays. Amendment No. 2 fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I withdraw Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDENT:

Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Schuneman.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I'd like to withdraw that amendment, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

All right, also withdrawn...

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

No, no...no, no. I'm sorry. I want to call the last amendment. I was confused on the numbers.

PRESIDENT:

Well, if you withdraw one, the number just...the number remains static. So, your last one will now be Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Okay, I'd like to call that amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Schuneman and, Senator Schuneman, this is the one hundred percent.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the same amendment. All it says is that if you don't want to cap it, if you don't want to accept a cap of fifty percent of the premiums, then cap it at a hundred percent of the premiums. Move adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1699. Discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Let me just briefly say while there may be some...what sounds like logic in that, the issue is still the same and that is we don't know yet and we don't know now and it would again make it...it's the wrong approach. The approach is to change the coverage and not to say November, December no insurance is available. The fact of the dollars isn't impacted by that nor again the input of public aid dollars saved and everything else that goes with it. It again has the wrong impact; even though it might sound good, it is also not clear what, in fact, period of time you're talking about. We have to oppose this as well. Now is not the way that...this is not the way to do it or yet, let the board come back to us with a recommendation once they've been constituted if they think there's going to be that type of a shortfall.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Schuneman, you wish to close on Amendment No. 3?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Only to say this, that I would rather see a plan established under which the managers of that plan if they see that there's going to be a shortfall would come back to the Legislature and say we think there's going to be a shortfall, we need some more money and we're

going to make this kind of change in the plan in order to try...to stop the plan from going in the red any more. Under your proposal, Senator, none of those safeguards are in there. What happens is if they pay the money out then the Legislature pays the bill. I think this is a reasonable approach and I would ask for your adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Schuneman has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1699. Those in favor of the amendment will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 21 Ayes, 26 Nays. Amendment No. 3 fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Carroll, do you wish to try to get back to that today?

SENATOR CARROLL:

Please.

PRESIDENT:

All right, with leave of the Body, we'll get back. If you'll take a look...the Secretary has distributed Supplemental Calendar No. 1. There are one, two, three, four, five, six motions with respect to gubernatorial action that have been filed. The members wish an opportunity to proceed on those. In addition to that, then we will go back to Senate 1699 and then there are four additional motions that have been filed and that will effectively conclude our business for today. All right, if I can have your attention. Before we move off the regular Calendar, Senator Haitland has a bill that he wishes to bring back for the purpose of an amendment. If you'll turn to page 4 on the Calendar...page 4 on the

Calendar, with leave of the Body, we'll move to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 3200. Senator Maitland is seeking leave of the Body...Senator Maitland is seeking leave of the Body to return House Bill 3200 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3200, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Maitland.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3200 deletes everything after the enacting clause and inserts the...the language contained in the amendment and it is...the amendment actually is...is technical in nature. It is...it's an amendment that was suggested to us by the Illinois Farm Development Authority and it...it allows for the entrance into the secondary market for one thing, and then also it does clarify...it does clarify that the State is responsible for that eighty-five percent that we are obligated for under the Debt Restructuring Act. It is technical in nature only and I would seek your...approval of this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3200. Discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Maitland, you wish to get back to

that today? All right, with leave of the Body, we'll get back to that one too. All right, let's move, with leave of the Body, to Supplemental Calendar No. 1, that's Senators Keats, Sangmeister, Jeremiah Joyce, Marovitz, Luft and Lemke. With...all right, on the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Motions in Writing to Override Item Vetoes, there's a motion in writing filed, Mr. Secretary, with respect to Senate Bill 1753.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 17, line 26 through 29 of Senate Bill 1753 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Keats.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is...this is four hundred thousand dollars for a sewer project in Northfield that is on the EPA's list, but it was put in ahead of time by a House member. Could you do me a favor and not make it too embarrassing and just give me a little help? Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, I'm...I'm sure that Senator Poshard and Senator O'Daniel have listened very intently to your debate and that we will summarily deal with this as...in...in a proper manner.

PRESIDENT:

All right, question is, shall the item on page 17, lines 26 through 29 of Senate Bill 1753 pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 12 Ayes,

26 Nays, none voting Present. The motion fails. Motion with respect to Senate Bill 1808, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 4, line 18 through 25 of Senate Bill 1808 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll on Senate Bill 1808.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Why, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to restore the funding of this item veto. Let me explain briefly. The Governor reduced the appropriation associated with a Statewide pretrial service agency. What's involved in this was in an effort to create a procedure for children facing trial as witnesses, we created substantive law, funded the court and funded the local prosecutors through the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutors Commission. While the Governor changed the effective date as to the Supreme Court, and that's why no motion to override as to that, he did sign into law the sections that deal with this particular funding and in order for us...and his message, therefore, is in error. He said that he did not sign it into law effective now. He was in error. He had. He had already signed it into law. This would provide the funding so that the prosecutors could, in fact, have the training so that when a kid has to testify, they can work with that child to avoid much of the trauma that has become associated with these trials and many of these...unfortunately these are all your cases of child abuse where the emotional needs of the child have to come first. The Governor took out that money thinking it was in the next fiscal year but he had signed this portion of the law into effect now, so the money needs to be funded now and I would, therefore, move that we fund the line item, the Governor's

veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the item on page 4, lines 18 through 25 of Senate Bill 1808 pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 19 Nays, none voting Present. The motion fails. Motion in writing with respect to Senate Bill 1759, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I...I move that the item on page 2, line 12 of Senate Bill 1759 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This seeks to restore approximately two hundred thousand dollars to the Vietnam Veterans' Outreach Program. That money to be used for jobs, for counseling and for other programs that are involved in this. Initially, upon looking at the veto, it was suggested that we proceed via supplemental, and several of these veterans have been down here involved in conferences and negotiations as to the feasibility of doing that. That process while it has not broken down has reached a point where they can receive no assurances as to what the final outcome will be. Ordinarily Senator Vadalabene would be here to handle this. He is not here today. I have been asked by these veterans to carry this program. Two hundred thousand dollars while it is a substantial amount of money, it is not relatively speaking to the way we vote on dollars around here a lot of dollars. I know that this is out of our ordinary

course. I think that this vote is probably very close. I would ask that those of you who feel you are locked into some philosophy with respect to the veto process see if you can look into your hearts to make an exception and vote to restore these funds. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

Discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, I've had the same veterans' organization lobbying me, and the Governor's Office still feels the same way about the two hundred thousand dollars, and I would suggest this is a compromise. Now I have not talked to the Governor personally, I have talked to Jim Reilly and suggested this, that the Governor issue an Executive Order suggesting that a person in the Department of Veterans' Affairs, one in Chicago, one in Springfield, one in East St...Louis, wherever they decide, is responsible for that specific issue whether it be agent orange or veterans' jobs and we could publish a list of those offices, who's responsible and, hopefully, that would satisfy most of the veterans' group; or the other thing that I suggested to the second floor was perhaps in their budget, the department's budget, we might be able to find seventy-five or a hundred thousand dollars to put together a program for veterans. I say, I do not have the commitment from the Governor. I have talked to Jim Reilly. He said, Pate, I think that is a...either one of those are reasonable proposals and as soon as the Governor comes back we will try to work something out.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in full support in the override of the

Governor's veto. This State just a few months ago was...was honored and seen probably the largest, single demonstration since the victory parades of World War II when the Vietnam Veterans came and marched in the City of Chicago in behalf of recognizing finally the contributions that these people played in the role and the history of the United States, and now here we have saying that, no, I'm sorry, even though you came in and you participated and there's a question on orange...on agent orange and a number of other physical problems that are attributed to their service of the United States, we come in and we reduce the amount of money for some very worthwhile programs that this Assembly passed. We can't have it both ways. If you were proud to be an American and you were proud to serve in the United States services in Vietnam and you supported the people that served in that conflict, now you say you can't afford the amount of money that we appropriated under this General Assembly? A mere two hundred and seventeen thousand dollars we're talking about. Let's be realistic. The only commitment that we have is a commitment between God and ourselves and our fellow man. These people deserve this type of appropriation and I would strongly encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lemke.

END OF REEL

REEL #3

SENATOR LEMKE:

I rise in support of this, and the reason being, every day I get up I go down past a few houses and look at a Vietnam Veteran who is in a wheelchair and needs this kind of guidance; and I think we have stand back too long in this State and in this country and fail to recognize the veterans of Vietnam. When these veterans came home from Vietnam they had to...they had to duck and hide and nobody cheered them, but we did it this June and honored them with a parade in Chicago and it was a people's parade. And I don't think the money here is worth one person being disabled in Vietnam. I think we must put this money into help these Vietnam Veterans, it's very, very important. I can't see the callousness because of budgetary reasons to deny this money. We must help veterans, we must help them get on the right side, and we must forget what happened to them with the Jane Fonda people when they came home and they were...on. It's time this State stands up as a Legislature and recognizes that these people that got shot at and wounded in Vietnam deserve this money and deserve recognition and deserve help. And we might as well forget about the people in...that represent Jane Fonda. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Joyce, you wish to close?

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

I do not disagree with the suggestion of Senator Philip, but the fact of the matter is that that is only a suggestion, the Governor has not signed on to that. These men have come here and they have been in this Chamber and we have pledged our support and...tried to express our gratitude, and I don't

SB 522
Spec. Recomm. of
the Gov.

see why we should be put in the position of saying no to them on this. If, in fact, that is a realistic approach that has been suggested by Senator Philip, the House...the House will have this matter, and the Governor will have time to act between the time we act today and the time to...the House acts. So once again I would just ask that you look into your hearts and see if you can deviate from the present philosophy and vote Aye on this.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, shall the Item on page 4...no, page 2, I beg your pardon, shall the item on page 2, line 12 of Senate Bill 1759 be restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor of the restoration will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 49 Ayes, 4 Nays, none voting Present. The item on page 2, line 12 of Senate Bill 1759 having received the required majority vote of Senators elected is declared restored, the item reduction of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. On the Order of Motions in Writing to Accept Specific Recommendations for Change, there's a motion filed with respect to Senate Bill 522, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 522 in the manner and form as follows. Signed Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I would move that we do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Senate Bill 522 creates the offense of second degree murder and eliminates the

offense of voluntary manslaughter. The Governor in his Veto Message makes the bill apply only to deaths after 1-1-87 and makes other technical changes in terms and names only. And I would ask that we do...concur with the Governor's specific recommendations for change.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the...all right, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 522 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Marovitz. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 522 having received the required constitutional majority vote of Senators elected are declared accepted. Senate Bill 1706, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1706 in the manner and form as follows. Signed, Senator Luft.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move to move that we accept the specific recommendations by the Governor for the changes in Senate Bill 1706. What the Governor did was eliminate a civic center's authority to retain interest on monies disbursed to by the State under the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act and also eliminated the part that increased from two to four the number of enterprise zones DCCA may certify during economic...emergencies and made various other technical corrections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Karpel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. President. As a matter of record I would just like to say that my vote on 1759, I believe, 59, I inadvertently pushed the wrong button. I would have liked to have been recorded as Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right, the record will so reflect. The...further discussion on Senator Luft's motion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1706 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Luft. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 1706 having received the required constitutional majority vote of Senators elected are declared accepted. Senate Bill 2177, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2177 in the manner and form as follows. Signed, Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What the Governor's amendment did was make a technical change to conform this Senate Bill 2177 to House Bill 2879 in regards to the two...to the...increase from two to four the number of enterprise zones OCCA may certify as economic emergencies. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to

Senate Bills 2177 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Lemke. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2177 having received the required constitutional majority vote of Senators elected are declared accepted. All right. With leave of the Body now, we will return to the...to the...Calendar...return to the Calendar as of this morning. We will...on the Order of...of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, page 2 on your original Calendar is Senate Bill 1699, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1699.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Let me just say first some thanks again. The process which worked which brought about this bill would not have been possible but for the able chairmanship of the various subcommittees of Senators DeAngelis, Berman, Kustra and Jones, and the able assistance of our general counsel, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, Neil Hartigan and his staff. This, as we all now know, is the comprehensive insurance plan that would provide needed insurance for people who can afford to pay. It is, in fact, a new day for our State; it is, in fact, an important step forward to providing jobs with dignity to those who have heretofore either been unable to find jobs because of a medical condition or...unable to move jobs for a better job because of the real

fear of losing what coverage they had by then being declared to have a preexisting condition. This is, in fact, an important step for the State to take because it does say that we recognize that people can have the assurance of being able to maintain their life style, being able to maintain what few assets they've been able to garner, like homes and all; and merely because they have had a medical condition inflicted upon them by no choice, they can still be a productive part of society, move forward, move forward as an aid and adjunct to the other citizens of Illinois who have contributed so long and hard towards the greatness of this State. I don't think it necessary to say more but to say thank you also to the hundred and fifty organizations that have signed up in support of this legislation as it has moved through the process. And I would urge all my fellow members to join us in this important step to let people move on and move on with dignity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, first of all, I'd like to commend Senators DeAngelis and Senator Carroll with the...and their committee for doing the work they did on it. There's no question this bill helps the middle-class American because the too poor can get Medicaid and Medicare, the too rich can afford to pay their own...health problem...health insurance problems and...and medical costs. And it's about time that we did take the lead because we all know there are people who are trying to work and yet they won't be hired because they have no...no health insurance and what have you. So, I speak in favor of the bill and I urge a favorable consideration by all of us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. First of all, I would like to remind the members that a good number of years ago there was an organization created nationwide called Communicating for Agriculture, and the gentleman who heads up that organization is the fellow who went around to the various states like Minnesota and Wisconsin and eventually Illinois and attracted a few of us that were concerned about the problem of the uninsurables in health care. What I find interesting is that obviously with a name like Communicating for Agriculture, he was thinking primarily about farm families. So, for those of you from rural areas it's kind of interesting to note that the real genesis of this program, whether it's in Illinois or in Minnesota or wherever, comes from individuals who are really concerned about depressed economies in rural America and how we were going to deal with it. I think that the point that Senator Geo-Karis made is...is well said, this is a program for the middle class. I come from a suburban constituency who often complains that they're passed by as we dole out benefits to everybody else. Well, here's a program for those folks who are, in fact, paying their taxes, they're paying their income and their sales taxes, they're putting those monies in the General Revenue Fund and regularly we draw on that General Revenue Fund for other people, but this affects those folks who are uninsurable, whether it's diabetes or a heart condition or whatever the...the ailment and allows them to access health insurance. Now we should add one caveat as we all run for the headlines and the media, and that is that not everyone who has those problems will be able to avail themselves of this program, because I read straight from the fact sheet distributed by the Attorney General, "Participants pay one hundred and thirty-five percent of a calculated average individual rate for coverage and must meet their deductibles in

twenty percent coinsurance." Thus, participants are expected to make a significant contribution to the cost of care. I think significant ought to be underlined. Anybody who walks away from this General Assembly after passing this bill and offers this program as some kind of a salvo for all the problems that exist out there in health care is just kidding the folks out there who have these problems, because, unfortunately, depending on your situation, not everyone will be able to avail themselves of this program under its current conditions. I would have preferred that we adopted Senator Schuneman's amendment because I think that gave us some protection against a runaway program which once we get it started I'm afraid will be very difficult to put any breaks on but we couldn't. I think we should make a small first step but we should continue to remind our constituents that they better have the money to come up with those premiums 'cause they're going to be high premiums and not everybody out there is going to be able to afford them. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill has been pretty much debated because the amendment was discussed. I would like to point out, however, that ten states have enacted similar legislation, eighteen other states are contemplating it. I think the bill brings Illinois out of a...a very dark period of not being concerned about those people who are gainfully employed and who stand the risk of losing everything they've worked for or who live in the fear that in the event they would get further disabled or ill that they would have to rely on public aid and destroy everything they've worked for. I would like to commend particularly all the affected interest groups because there were many that were involved in this

and the effort of all those people. I would also like to assure members of this body that there's no intention to let this program run wild; there is, in fact, a mechanism in this bill to create a responsible...responsible advisory committee that will look at this, and I am hopeful that our appointees will reflect that sense of responsibility. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. While I would much have preferred to have some kind of cap in this bill and I would much prefer to have us wait until we know more about what's in here, I'm going to vote for the bill. I think that it...it fills a need in our society, and there are indeed people out there who cannot buy insurance and who need to buy insurance. I'd...I'd like to reiterate one of the things that Senator Kustra said, however, and that is that when you look at the premiums that are going to have to be charged, which apparently are going to be about eleven hundred dollars per year per individual, approximately that, that people once having paid those premiums and then who have to pay a five hundred dollar deductible and then meet another four hundred dollar cost before they get into the coverage, not everyone will be able to afford this. But I don't think we should stand in the way of...of a good program even though it may not have everything in it that...that I'd like to see there. So I'm going to vote in favor of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. Not to belabor the point that this legislation has been thoroughly debated, but as a participant...as a...and as a co-

sponsor of this bill, I'm glad to see that we have mostly all the members of the Illinois Senate on board as regard this legislation. We know it is not a perfect piece of legislation but it is something that has been debated over many, many hours, there are many participants who had their input trying to solve a very, very serious social problem and this is a social problem. And...if there are problems with the legislation we still will have time next year to deal with necessary amendments to it to...to make necessary changes if we find that it is not working as we want it to work. But it is a step in the right direction, it solves a social problem in the State of Illinois, and I want to commend the Attorney General and the chief sponsor, Howard Carroll, for putting that many hours into this bill to make this possible for all the people of the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1699 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1699 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. All right. Leave of the Body, now we'll go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 4, is House Bill 3300. I am told that there is an amendment for that...and then we'll come back to House Bill 3200. So, with leave of the Body, we'll go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 3300, Mr. Secretary. Senator Lechowicz seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3300 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment...is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 3300, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senators Lechowicz and Philip.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment makes three...three revisions to the Charitable Games Act. It provides veteran organizations will become eligible for charitable games license, the bet limit is increased to fifty dollars for games within the...participants may only win merchandise and the five dollar bet limit will remain intact for games allowing participants to win cash, and it eliminates the sunset provision in the bill. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

All right. Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1...to House bill...I beg your pardon,...House amendment...Senator Lechowicz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3300. Is there discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

3rd reading. All right. Leave of the Body, now we will return to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading and take up House Bill 3200, Mr. Secretary. House Bill 3-2-0-0.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 3200.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 3200 as amended...and I explained this in the amendment process but just...just let me say briefly that it does clarify the State's commitment to the original thirty million dollar loss reserve fund and states that that thirty million dollars is a general obligation of the State. There was some question as to whether or not this was, in fact,...explained accurately and...and, again, it's a technical amendment and I would urge support of House Bill 3200.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3200 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The bill...House Bill 3200 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 3300, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 3300.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 3300 as amended now will permit veterans' organizations to participate in the bill that we passed earlier this year as far as Charitable Games Act. As you know, many veterans' organizations were under the impression that they would be able to participate and raise money for their organizations with the Charitable Games Act. 501C3 was the

key provision in the bill that it was originally passed. With the passage of 3300 as amended, the wording in it now would state that...any organization...any...the term qualified organization shall also mean any past, organization of past or present members of the Armed Force of the United States or any auxiliary unit or society thereof or a trust or foundation for any such post, organization organized and conducted on a not-for-profit basis with no personal profit to anyone as a result of its operation and which is exempt from Federal income taxation under Section 501(c)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code. This would provide qualified organizations, veterans' organizations to participate in Charitable Gamings Act or Las Vegas Nights. Many of you probably during the campaign heard and listened to the plea of these organizations to be included in this legislation. The leadership met this morning and hopefully with the agreement of this Body will pass House Bill 3300 as amended which provides for this type of organization participation. I encourage an Aye vote on House Bill 3300 as amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEWUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of House Bill 3300. During this past November election and after we came out of Session, for some reason I was as misinformed as many of my constituents, because I thought when we passed the Las Vegas Night that we also included the VFW, American Legion, et cetera. Well, I found out before the election from the largest VFW post in the State of Illinois which happens to be in Bensonville, Illinois, my district, that we did not include them and they were prohibited from having a Las Vegas Night. So, of course, I started calling around and Senator Lechowicz and I worked out this amendment. It does the job, it's certainly

going to make all the veterans' organizations throughout the State of Illinois happy and pleased and there's no reason why they shouldn't be entitled to a Las Vegas Night too, for a lot of good causes. So I would hope that we'd see a lot of Aye votes up there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I...I have a couple of questions. Senator Lechowicz, does this mean we won't have to put the Constitutional Amendment on it so they can have the money to pay for their VFW halls that's just been beaten three times?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Well, that really is not addressed in 3300, but I supported that Constitutional Amendment, maybe this will help them a little bit as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

So did I, and I...but I think maybe after three tries in a row we ought to cool it until we figure out how to pass it for awhile. My question...my serious question is that if you...if I read your language correctly, we still have not included groups such as the Lions and the Jaycees. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That is correct. Basically, we're going to try to address that, the Lions and the Jaycees and the fraternal next year, I would imagine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, you know, it's job security for all of us, I guess, we just keep putting bills in. But I rise in support of the bill, I think it is a...a good step, I think that these groups will handle this responsibility well. I have normal concerns that there are liable to be a few bad actors in...in any barrel. But I...I think eventually we are going to have to address the Jaycees and the Lions. In my part of the State it isn't the churches or the veterans' groups that run the Las Vegas Nights; frankly, it's the Jaycees and the Lions. But I'm smart enough to know that the passage of this bill, hopefully by a big margin, will make my job all the easier next year. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEHUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Lechowicz may close.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I'd really appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall House Bill 3300 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are 2, none voting Present. House Bill 33 having...3300 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think that all that remains are four or five additional motions that have been filed. I'd ask the members to stay put, we've got about another twenty minutes work and then we'll be concluded until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

With leave of the Body, we will go to the remaining motions that we have. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that Senate Rule 5C be waived with respect to House Bill 132, that the Senate Committee on Revenue be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 132 and that the bill be read a second time and placed on the Calendar on the Order of 3rd Reading. Signed, Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I think the first proper motion would be to move to...for leave to be substituted as the sponsor in place of Senator Holmberg.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, we can...we can...we can do that. Senator Lemke has requested leave of the Body to...to remove...to remove Senator Holmberg and to add Senator Lemke as the principal sponsor of House Bill 132?

SENATOR LEMKE:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there...is leave granted? Leave is granted and it's so ordered. Senator Lemke now moves to suspend Rule 5C and asked that House Bill 132 be discharged from the Committee on Revenue and advanced to the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Philip...Senator...Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Yeah, I...I have a question. Normally when we do these unusual things, at least we have the courtesy of talking to the leadership on either side of the aisle. I have no idea what this bill does, what they're going to do with it or how, when and why. And I certainly would like to...like to find

out what's going on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I...I...I thought they talked to the leadership. What this bill is going to be used for is to try to come up with some kind of enterprise zone program to save the General Motors Plant in Willow Springs. We can't...they're meeting tomorrow at DCCA and...and we have to move this to get it in position.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Am I to assume that the Governor's Office is involved in the negotiations or are we just winging it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

DCCA is meeting tomorrow in the Village Hall of Willow Springs and working out some type of arrangements. We may not need this bill, but if we don't move it, this is the only vehicle around and I will not move it for any other reason but that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? All right. If not, Senator Lemke has...has moved to suspend Senate Rule 5C...and...and...for the purpose of discharging House Bill 132 from the Committee on Revenue and asked that it be advanced to the Order of 3rd Reading. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Lemke now moves to discharge House Bill 132...to...to the Order of...House bill...all right, Senator Lemke has moved to discharge House Bill 132 from the Committee on Revenue and asked that it be placed on the Order of 2nd Reading in order

that it may be read a third time. Objections? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. So ordered. Mr. Secretary, House bills 2nd reading is House Bill 132.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 132.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Further motions, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

I move to suspend Senate Rule 5 and that the Committee on Revenue be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 313 and that it be placed on the Senate Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Signed, Senators Demuzio and Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. With leave of the Body, is there leave to have Senator Watson handle that? Leave is granted. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you,...thank you, Mr. President. This particular bill, House Bill 313, is in the Revenue Committee sponsored by Senator Donahue. I have talked to Senator Donahue and both Senator Netsch and Kustra concerning what we want to do with this particular piece of legislation, have no objection, and I would like to ask for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Watson requests that the sponsorship of House Bill 313 read Demuzio, Watson and Donahue. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. So ordered. Senator Watson now

moves to suspend Rule 5C in order that House Bill 313 may be discharged from the Committee on Revenue and brought to the Order of 2nd Reading. Discussion? Senator...discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Rule 5C is suspended. Senator Watson now moves to discharge the Committee on Revenue from further consideration of House Bill 313 and that it be brought to the Order of 2nd Reading. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. So ordered. Mr. Secretary, you want to read that bill a second time.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 313.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Further motions?

SECRETARY:

(Machine cutoff)...move that Senate Rule 5C we waived with respect to House Bill 2815 and that the Senate Executive Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 2815 and the bill be placed on the Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Signed, Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and members of the Senate. In regards to this motion, not only did we check with the chairman of the Executive Committee, Senator Sangmeister, we also checked with Senator Schuneman...relative to this legislation. This is

the...Health Club Physical Fitness Service Act. This amendment would delete the five thousand dollar maximum contract amount, set the maximum contract amount at an average of twenty-five hundred dollars a year for a maximum of two years and allow...increase the payment time from two years to three years. Everyone has been checked with and I...from what I understand, there is no objection to this. And I would ask the adoption...well, I would ask for the passage of this motion first.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Discussion?

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Discharge the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Well, Senator Marovitz has moved that...to suspend the appropriate Senate Rule 5C in order that House Bill 2815 can be discharged from the Committee on Executive and be placed on the Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Is..those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Marovitz now moves to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of House Bill 2815 and be placed on the Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. All right, further motions? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I believe there's an amendment...that's been filed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Well, we'll handle that when...when we get there. We've just now discharged it and put in on the Order of 2nd Reading. We...we are not on the Order of 2nd Reading at the moment. Senator Marovitz,...do you wish to proceed with the adoption of the amendment? All right. On the Order of...with leave of the Body, we'll move to the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 2815, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 2815.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

In the...in the current bill there's a five thousand dollar maximum contract amount. This amendment would change that five thousand dollar contract amount and in effect reduce it so it would be a twenty-five hundred dollar average with a twenty-five hundred dollar maximum in any year. So, if...if it were a year and a half it would be twenty-five hundred plus a...plus a fraction of twenty-five hundred. The bill retains the increase in payment years of contract from two years to three years. And I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2815. Discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, we have no objection to the amendment as we understand the amendment, but as I read it, it deletes five thousand dollars and says that in lieu thereof it will be an average of twenty-five hundred dollars per year for a maximum of two years. So that doesn't necessarily mean it's got to be twenty-five hundred dollars a year, it could be five thousand...okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2815. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. All right. Leave of the Body, we'll go back to motions...in writing. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move that...to suspend Senate Rule 5C and that Senate Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 3522 and that it be placed on the Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Signed, Senator Geo-Karis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I just would like leave to...of the House to...discharge and bring it back to...to the Floor for 2nd reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Geo-Karis, your motion is to suspend Rule 5C and that the Senate Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of...of the House Bill 3522 and that it be placed on the Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Is there any objection?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is that...is that correct?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Yeah. If not, I wonder if...since my guide is not on the Floor, can we just take this on tomorrow? There any objection?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

No, I just got a phone call. All right. Senator Geo-

Karis has moved to suspend Rule 5C and that the committee...Senate Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 3522 and that it be placed on the Order of...the Senate Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading. Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Geo-Karis now moves to discharge the Committee on...on Senate Rules and that House Bill...3522 be placed on the Order of the Senate Calendar on 2nd Reading. Those in favor of that motion indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion is adopted. Further motions in writing?

SECRETARY:

I move that the Senate Executive Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 1217 and that the resolution be placed on the Calendar on the Order of the Secretary's Desk. Signed, Senator Rock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1217 addresses the controversy between the Independent Federation of Flight Attendants and Trans World Airlines and very simply resolves that the members of the State Senate support the Independent Federation of Flight Attendants in its dispute with TWA by urging TWA to bargain in good faith to reach a fair contract settlement and that while conducting State business we will utilize another airline for the duration of this labor dispute. I think the flight attendants deserve our expression of support, and so I would move to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration and ask that the Senate resolution be considered immediately and voted upon once we get it to the Secretary's Desk.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right...Senator Fawell on...on Senator Rock's motion to discharge? Senator Fawell. All right. Senator Schuneman.
SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Rock,...do you know of another instance when the Senate...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well,...Senator Schuneman, I'd like to get to the merits of the legislation once we get it in the proper position.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Okay...okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Rock moves to...to waive...all right, moves to discharge the Senate Executive Committee from further consideration of Senate Resolution 1217 and that it...and it would be brought to the Order of Secretary's Desk. Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion is carried. Senate Resolution 1217 now reposes on the Secretary's Desk. Senator Rock, you wish to take that up? Senate Resolution 1217, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1217, and there are no committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Senate resolution very simply says that the members of the State Senate support the Independent Federation of Flight Attendants and urge TWA to bargain in good faith to reach a fair contract settlement. There are a number of whereases and preambles, but that in essence is what this resolution does. I think it's just an expression of support on behalf of the Independent Federation of Flight

Attendants and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator...Senator Fawell on this...on this motion.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I have been asked to be a cosponsor of this resolution which I have gladly done. I think if you will read the resolution you will see the fairness of it. It is not fair for the union to go and ask the men to take a fifteen percent cut and then turn around and ask the women to take a forty-five percent cut because "they are not breadwinners of their family." As we well know eighty percent of the women nowadays are indeed breadwinners or contribute to the support of their families. This is not fair. I think in all fairness we should be willing to support these women in something that on the face of it is...is just not right. And I think I can put my record against anyone in this...in this Assembly as far as being probusiness, but I think in this particular instance they are dead wrong and I think we ought to all be on board and...and say yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Senator Rock,...the flight attendants themselves, do they have a...a union...I gather they have a union representing them but they are unhappy with the union resolution of the...this particular problem. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I...I think they're unhappy with TWA because TWA is utilizing, as Senator Fawell pointed out, a double standard. They said to the male personnel, take a fifteen percent cut and they said to the female personnel, you take a forty-five percent cut. That...all we're doing is urging them to bargain in good faith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

I gather there is a union position involved in this, however. I mean, are we being asked as a legislative body, this being the Senate, State of Illinois, to do something to involve ourselves in what might be considered a...a labor question in this case or whatever. Is this a little unusual for us to be doing, has this happened before? Is it really our business? I guess these are my questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, my recollection is, it has happened before. We have gone on record in support of, for instance, positions taken by labor unions, namely AFSCME. What we are...all we are saying here is that we are expressing our support for the position that women employees and men employees ought to be treated equally and thus urging TWA to bargain in good faith.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? Senator...Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Well, I rise in support of this. Anytime that any group would ask some people to take a forty-five percent cut when others only take fifteen percent, it's just dead wrong. I'm in strong support of this thing and I think everybody on this Floor should be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Rock moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1217. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate Resolution 1217 is adopted. I would...the Chair...the...the Chair would like to chastise the members in the gallery, no applause, please. Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

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

House Joint Resolution 243, and it is congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Consent Calendar. Senator Luft,...I...well, Senator Luft, it's my understanding that you have a motion that you...oh, tomorrow. Okay, we'll hold it till Friday. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1261 offered by Senators...Barkhausen, Philip and all Senators except Senator Dudycz. It's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 1262, Senator Keats, congratulatory.
1263, Senator Zito, congratulatory.

And 1264, Senator Davidson and all Senators and its congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Consent Calendar. All right. With leave of the Body, we'll go to the introduction of bills. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 2315 introduced by Senators Geo-Karis,

Lechowicz, Philip, Weaver and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2316, by Senators Barkhausen, Lechowicz, Philip, Weaver, DeAngelis and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2317, by...introduced by Senators Dudycz, Lechowicz, Philip, Weaver, DeAngelis and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senate Rules. Senator Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to be...leave of the Body to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor of House Bill 313.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Alright. Senator Dunn has requested leave of the Body to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor of House Bill 313. Is leave granted? Leave is granted? So ordered. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, I think we have pretty much effectively concluded our business. Nine o'clock tomorrow morning, Senator Philip and I have agreed that we would come in at nine o'clock tomorrow morning with the hope that we will be swiftly concluding our business. So all that remains is to open and close the Third Special and we're...we're effectively concluded today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Senator Rock, nine o'clock? All right. Senator Rock moves that the Regular Session be...we adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning. Senate Regular Session stands adjourned.

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

NOVEMBER 19, 1986

HB-0132	SECOND READING	PAGE	87
HB-0132	MOTION	PAGE	85
HB-0313	SECOND READING	PAGE	88
HB-0313	MOTION	PAGE	87
HB-2815	SECOND READING	PAGE	89
HB-2815	MOTION	PAGE	88
HB-3200	RECALLED	PAGE	64
HB-3200	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
HB-3300	RECALLED	PAGE	79
HB-3300	THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-3522	MOTION	PAGE	91
SB-0522	VETO ACTION	PAGE	71
SB-1516	VETO ACTION	PAGE	5
SB-1699	RECALLED	PAGE	37
SB-1699	THIRD READING	PAGE	74
SB-1706	VETO ACTION	PAGE	72
SB-1738	VETO ACTION	PAGE	14
SB-1738	VETO ACTION	PAGE	21
SB-1749	VETO ACTION	PAGE	25
SB-1752	VETO ACTION	PAGE	17
SB-1753	VETO ACTION	PAGE	19
SB-1753	VETO ACTION	PAGE	65
SB-1759	VETO ACTION	PAGE	67
SB-1808	VETO ACTION	PAGE	66
SB-1951	VETO ACTION	PAGE	34
SB-2177	VETO ACTION	PAGE	73
SB-2255	VETO ACTION	PAGE	33
SB-2306	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2307	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2308	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2309	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2310	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2311	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2312	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2313	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2314	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-2315	FIRST READING	PAGE	96
SB-2316	FIRST READING	PAGE	97
SB-2317	FIRST READING	PAGE	97
SR-1217	MOTION	PAGE	92
SR-1217	ADOPTED	PAGE	92
SR-1250	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SR-1251	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SR-1252	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SR-1253	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SR-1254	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SR-1255	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-1256	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-1257	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-1258	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-1259	ADOPTED	PAGE	3
SR-1260	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SR-1261	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	96
SR-1262	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	96
SR-1263	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	96
SR-1264	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	96

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER - SENATOR DEMUZIO	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REV. JOHN SPREEN	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - POSTPONED	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	1
HB132 - DISCHARGED FROM COMMITTEE	PAGE	85

REPORT: TIFLDAY
12:32

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2
04/18/88

NOVEMBER 19, 1986

SUBJECT MATTER

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
ADJOURNMENT

PAGE 96
PAGE 97