54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of ten having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer this morning by Pastor Bob Hanson, Greenview United Church, Greenview, Illinois. Reverend. THE REVEREND BOB HANSON:

(Prayer by the Reverend Bob Hanson)

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Thank you, Reverend. Reading of the Journal, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Journal for Friday, June 21, 1991.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hall.

# SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Hall. Any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. Senator Hall.

# SENATOR HALL:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Monday, June 24th; Tuesday, June 25th; Wednesday, June 26th; and Thursday, June 27th, in the year 1991, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Hall. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. Messages from the House.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to recede from their amendments to a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 10.

I am further directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives requests a first committee of conference to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to the amendments to the bill.

Action taken by the House June 28, 1991.

I have like Messages on:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 11;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 86;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 130;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 133;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 264;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 539;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 703;

House Amendments 1, 3 and 8 to Senate Bill 922;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 972;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 978;

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1009;

House -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1016;

And House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1364

Action taken by the House, June 28, 1991.

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendments to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 1431 with Senate Amendments 1 and 2.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

I have a like Message on:

House Bill 1982 with Senate Amendment No. 1.

Non-concurred in by the House, June 28, 1991.

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 45 with House Amendment No. 1.

Passed by the House, as amended, June 28, 1991.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Secretary's Desk. All right. The House has asked -- asked that we accede to their request for a conference committee on Senate Bills 10, 11, 86, 130, 133, 264, 539, 703, 922, 972, 978, 1009, 1016 and 1364. Senator Demuzio moves that the Senate does accede to the request of the House. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate does accede to the request of the House. Resolutions.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 631 offered by Senator Dudycz.

It is congratulatory.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Resolution 632 offered by Senator Rea.

It is substantive.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive. Committee Reports.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs, to which was referred the Governor's Messages of April 30, 1991; May 13, 1991; June 4, 1991;

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

and June 7, 1991, reported the same back with the recommendations that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in his Messages of April 30th, May 13th, June 4th, June 7th, June 24th, June 26th and June 27th, 1991; the Secretary of State's Message of June 25th, 1991, and the Treasurer's Message of June 25th, 1991.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Kelly. Discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All -- the Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate is now in Executive Session. Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of April 30th, 1991, I will read the salaried appointment to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the State Board of Elections with a term expiring June 30, 1995:

Lawrence Johnson of Champaign.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment with a three-fifths vote of the elected members, as required for the confirmation, on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to this appointment. Will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

nominations just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

### SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect of the Governor's Message of May 13, 1991, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments & Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be Assistant Director of the Department of Agriculture, for a term ending January 18, 1993:

James Michael Baise of Jacksonville.

To be the Public Counsel, for a term ending May 15, 1996:

Mary K. Nolan of Chicago.

To be a member of the Court of Claims, for a term ending January 16, 1995:

Norma Jann of Chicago.

To be the Chairman of the Illinois Human Rights Commission, for a term ending January 16, 1995:

Manuel Barbosa of Elgin.

To be members of the Illinois Human Rights Commission, for terms ending January 16, 1995:

Wallace Heil of Taylorville.

Nancy Jefferson of Chicago.

Jane Hayes Rader of Cobden.

To be members of the Illinois Industrial Commission for terms ending January 16, 1995:

Richard Gilgis of Downers Grove.

John Hallock of Rockford.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of May 13, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments & Veterans' Affairs recommended that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Capital Development Board, for a term ending January 16, 1995:

Gary Skoien of Palatine.

Having read this unsalaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to this appointment. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

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. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of June 4, 1991, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments & Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Civil Service Commission for a term ending March 1, 1997:

Harry Conlon of Oak Lawn.

To be a member of the Court of Claims, for a term ending January 20, 1997:

Randall Patchett of Marion.

To be a member of the Illinois Industrial Commission, for a term ending January 16, 1995:

Linzey Jones of Chicago.

To be members of the Property Tax Appeal Board, for a term ending January 20, 1997:

Michael Brown of Chrystal Lake

And Homer Henke of Moro.

To be the Public Administrator of Cook County, for a term ending January 6, 1993 -- I'm sorry -- December 6, 1993:

Louis Apostol of Glenview.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted?

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Leave is granted. Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. 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 Senate — a majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly. SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of June 4th, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be members of the State Board of Education, with terms ending January 20, 1997:

Mary Ann Shirley MacLean of Mettawa Marcene Mitchell of Chicago Herbert Roach, Jr. of O'Fallon And Michael Skarr of Naperville.

To be members of the Board of Higher Education, for a term ending January 31, 1997:

Bruce Chelberg of Arlington Heights
Edwin Moore of Lincolnshire
And Jane Williamson of Kenilworth.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted?

Leave is granted. Any discussion? If not, the question is, does

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly — I'm sorry — Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I was at the -- by Senator MacDonald's desk, and I couldn't get back fast enough. I wanted to be recorded as Aye, if I were at my desk, on the prior roll call, please.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

The record will so reflect. Senator Kelly. SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of June 7, 1991, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, for a term ending May 1, 1993:

William Dugan -- Dugan of Countryside.

To be members of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, for a term ending May 1, 1995:

Cal Covert of Rockford

Tom Hanley of Park Ridge.

To be the Chairman of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, for a term ending May 1, 1995:

John Garrow of Wheaton.

Having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

has an objection to these appointments. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of June 7th, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the State Board of Education for a term ending January 20, 1997:

Jackie Brekenridge of Chicago.

To be members of the Board of Governors at State Colleges and Universities, for terms ending January 20, 1997:

Daniel Goodwin of Oakbrook

Mack Hollowell of Charleston

And Wilma Sutton of Chicago.

To be members of the Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees, for terms ending January 20, 1997:

John Brewster of Herrin

And George Wilkins, Jr. of Edwardsville.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. Mr. President,

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

We're getting there, but we got a couple more to go. Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of June 24th, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Bi-State Development Authority, for a term ending January 15, 1996:

William Reheis of Columbia.

To be members of the Central Midwest Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Commission, for a term ending January 18, 1993:

Clark Bullard of Urbana

And Tom Ortciger of Flossmoor.

To be a member of the State Board of Education, for a term ending January 20, 1993:

Coni Batlle of Chicago.

To be a member of the Illinois Development Finance Authority, for a term ending January 18th, 1993:

Ken Solomon of Morton Grove.

To be a member of the Lottery Control Board, for a term ending July 1, 1994:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

James Althoff of Crystal Lake.

To be a member of the Worker's Compensation Advisory Council, for a term ending February 1, 1994:

Greg Baise of Springfield.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senator elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr President. With respect to the Secretary of State's Message of June 25, 1991, I will read the salaried appointment to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be Commissioner of the Merit Commission for the Office of Secretary of State, for a term ending January 30th, 1997 -- I'm sorry -- June 30th, 1997. It's good to have capable staff.

James L. Wright of Chicago.

Mr. President, having read this salaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. -- Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Treasurer's Message of June 25, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be members of the Treasurer's Personnel Review Board, for terms ending June 30, 1997:

J. Timothy Eaton of Wilmette

And Priscilla M. McEnroe of Winnetka.

And, Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected,

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of June 26, 1991, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be the Deputy Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies, for a term ending February 1, 1993:

Joanne Mitchell of Chicago.

To be the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions, for a term ending January 18, 1993:

Gilbert Ruiz of McHenry.

To be the Assistant Director fo the Department of Financial Institutions, for a term ending January 18, 1993:

Halina Bielowicz of Glenview.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to these appointments. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

#### SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. And finally, with respect to the

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Governor's Message of June 27, 1991, I will read the unsalaried appointment to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Advisory Board to the Department of Conservation, for a term ending January 20, 1997:

Arthur Janura of Palatine.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection. And, Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

That was a miscue. All right. You've heard the Gentleman's request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected, concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate arise from Executive Session.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's motion to arise from Executive Session. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate does now arise. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a special guest. If I could have your attention. And the Chair will yield to Senator Sam Vadalabene.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

# SENATOR VADALABENE:

Could I have some quiet, please. We have some special guests here this morning, and I'm honored to present to you Miss Launa Arrington from East Alton, Illinois -- uh-huh -- the Miss Illinois Junior National Teenage Champion, who will represent us in Illinois in Florida. Launa, please. Give her a nice welcome.

# LAUNA ARRINGTON:

(Remarks by Launa Arrington)

#### SENATOR VADALABENE:

Along with Launa is her mother, her grandmother and her brother. Let's give them a welcome. Uh-huh.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Again, in an effort to move the paper transmittal between the Houses, we'll start at Page 16 on the Calendar. Page 16. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence. The motion under this Order will be to refuse to recede and request a conference committee or to recede from Senate Amendments, in which case that's final action. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence, House Bill 70, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 70.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Joyce.

# SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would refuse to recede and ask that a conference committee be appointed.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Joyce moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoptions of Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 70 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Rigney, for

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Mr. President, I'd like to make an introduction - an old friend that has come back to visit with us. We have here at my desk, Tom McMaster, a former Member of the Illinois House.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Tom, nice to see you again. Welcome.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Top of Page 17. Senator Joyce. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence. House Bill 114, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 114.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 and ask that a conference committee be appointed.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 114 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 703. Senator DeAngelis. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 703.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I move -- I move that the Senate recede from Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 703.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved to recede from Senate All right. Amendments 1 and 2. This is final action, Ladies and Gentlemen. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate does recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 703. the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1123. Senator Davidson. 1171. Cullerton. Madam Secretary, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1171.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I would move to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1171 and ask that a conference committee be appointed.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1171 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 1183, Madam Secretary, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1183.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

#### SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1183 and a conference committee be set.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1183 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 1528. Senator Welch. Madam Secretary, please.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1528.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Welch.

# SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, I would move that the Senate non-concur in Amendment No. 1.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1528 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 1878. Senator Severns. 1191. Senator Luft. 1911. Senator Luft. No. 1955. Senator Watson. 2147. Senator Joyce. 2491. Senator Jerome Joyce. The Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence, middle of Page 17, House Bill 1878, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1878.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Severns.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

#### SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I move that we refuse to recede from Amendment No. 1 and send this bill to conference.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1878 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Bottom of Page 17. House Bill 2491, Madam Secretary.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2491.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Joyce.

# SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 and ask that a conference committee be appointed.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman has — has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2491 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Watson's back on the Floor. House Bill 1955, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1955.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Watson.

# SENATOR WATSON:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Yes. Thank you. I would ask that we refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1955 and ask for a conference committee.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1955 and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll move then to Page 10 on the Calendar. Page 10 on the Calendar. We'll go through the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence. The Chair has been informed that the appropriations folks will be meeting at noon, so we will leave those bills in their present posture for the moment. We'll go through that Order, and then there's a Supplemental Calendar, and then we'll take a recess.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senate Bill 131. Senator Woodyard. All right. Bottom of Page 10, Secretary's Desk, Concurrence is Senate Bill 131, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 131.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill, as it left the Senate, Senate Bill 131, was the balloon dart game, which is a rather a noxious bill. When it came back from the House, it carries an immediate effective date. And that's all the bill does. And I would move for concurrence.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 131. Those in favor will

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

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 44, the Nays are 7, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 131. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 11. Senate Bill 151, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 151.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Move we non-concur in Senate Bill 151.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Jacobs moves that the -- to -- moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 151. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 155 -- 158. Senator Jones. On the Order of -- Senate Bill 158, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 158.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of -- of the Senate. I'd like to divide the question on the amendments, and I'd like to move to concur in House Amendment No. 1. House Amendment No. 1 is the State Board's request, and what it does is it moves up the date from which a plan must be filed for the expenditure of funds. And I move that we concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 158.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 158. 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 -- the -- on that question, the Ayes are 48, the Nays are 3, 1 voting Present. Senator Jones.

### SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate non-concur in House Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones moves that to non-concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 158. All in favor of the motion will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. 267. Senator Schuneman. Madam Secretary, Senate Bill 267, please.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 267.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

# SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the Department of Insurance proposal that would lead to continued certification of the Illinois Department of Insurance by the NAIC certification system. I think all the controversial issues in this bill have been resolved, with the possible exception of the assessment fee. And there have been some talks with Golden Rule Insurance Company; and, while they are not in support of the bill, I think it's fair to say that the majority of insurance companies doing business in this State are now in support. And I would ask for concurrence at this time. Be happy to respond to any questions.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Excuse me. Discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

In the past few days, Senator Schuneman, you and I and others have had some discussions regarding language that would make the fund subject to appropriations by the General Assembly, which under this bill, as it stands now, it would not be. Are you adopting language - and I think the bill is Senate Bill 1310 - that will incorporate that revision?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, just to correct the statement, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator Schuneman. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we take the conferences off the Floor, please? Senator Schuneman. SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Just to correct a statement. People persist in saying that the funds that would be accumulated here are not subject to appropriation, and that's not true. Every dollar that goes into this fund is subject to appropriation by the General Assembly and cannot be spent without that appropriation. The language that you have been working on with the Department will be amended into a -- another bill going to conference committee, which is Senate Bill -- 1310. So that -- we are in agreement that that language will be adopted. It is not in this bill, but it will be in a following bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Senator Berman.

#### SENATOR BERMAN:

All right. With that understanding, Mr. President, I stand in support of this bill. There -- as the principal sponsor has indicated, there is still some differences of opinion in -- with some of the companies that -- that do business in Illinois, but I think that we can address their concerns, hopefully, at some later date. The items that are in this bill are important from the point of view of monitoring the fiscal health of the insurance industry, and I stand in support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jones.

# SENATOR JONES:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and -- there have been many discussions on this bill, because it is very complex and has a larger amendment. As I indicated before, I really wanted the committee to really look into this, and I know they're -- many persons have agreed with the concept, but I just wanted to add for the record -- answer -- ask the sponsor a couple of questions so we can get it into the record. Senator Schuneman, can you tell us how much money, during the first year, would be diverted from -approximately how much would be diverted from General Revenue as a result of this bill if it is enacted?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

The first year is about four million dollars, Senator. That

-- and you understand that the money that would not flow into the

General Revenue Fund is equal to the amount of money that will not

be requested from the General Revenue Fund. So it's intended to

be revenue-neutral as far as the General Revenue Fund is

concerned.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Okay. And, for the record, again, we indicated that after talking with you and members from the Department as it relate to the ceiling and the cap about the purported regressiveness that may be in the bill — the Director of Legislative Affairs, and we discussed this, and he indicated that system wide, he would open up and discuss this if they found that the way this structure is it would be regressive to small companies. Is that still a viable situation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I'm not sure I understood all your question. But I understood it, what you were inquiring about was whether the Department would be willing to discuss with the industry, fairness and equity of the fees that are being assessed. Was that Okay. And the answer to that is yes. the question? Yes. The Director has agreed that if the industry as a is dissatisfied with these -- this fee structure, that certainly that is a process that -- that he would be willing to institute so that there could be discussion of that issue. Now, there will always probably be some company out there that may not like what we've done, just like there are some taxpayers that don't always like every tax we pass. But the Director has agreed to basically what you're -- you were asking about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, in response to that. I -- what it was is that if -- if those companies ... I know that those who have a large volume of

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

premium should not necessarily be in agreement with those who have a small volume of premium. I thought the discussion that we had for the record is that the Director will sit down with the smaller companies system wide and try to see if there's -- if there is a problem where it has an adverse impact, not to let the larger volume companies decide what's for the best. And that -- that was the understanding that I had.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Schuneman.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I think that's absolutely a reasonable request. And I think, as you know, most small companies are going to pay less under this system than they have in the past. But there may be some that are unhappy with it, and -- and they have the right to come forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Hall. Representative Stepan.

#### SENATOR HALL:

Will -- will -- pardon me just a minute. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Hall.

# SENATOR HALL:

Senator, would you tell us the names of the companies that are -- would be involved?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

# SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, there are over four hundred companies that would be involved here. And I think that it's fair to say that almost all of them have -- have agreed to this additional tax, so that they

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

can make sure that the Department is able to do the financial examination of all insurance companies, including the ones that are in trouble, that -- that should be done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Well, would you please tell me, what's Golden Rule's position on this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall. I'm sorry. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, as I can best describe Golden Rule's position, they have told me in conversations with me, that they don't object to the two-thousand-dollar additional fee that they would have to pay here, but there are two things that they object to; one is they object to the fact that whatever money might be in this fund will not go directly into the General Revenue Fund. They object to that. They also object to the idea that some groups of companies - Allstate is a -- or State Farm is a good example - where they have a number of companies, that -- a -- a group will not be required to pay more than a hundred thousand dollars in fees. But those are the two objections, as I understand them, that Golden Rule has raised to this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman may close.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I think we've had a lot of debate on this, Mr. President. I simply ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 -- Senator Schuneman -- concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 267. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

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 47, the Nays are 5, 1 voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 267. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 15. If you'll all turn to Page 15 on your Calendar. Senate Bill 407. Senator Jones. Senator Jones. I'm trying my best to rescue you. 407. Senate Bill 407, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 407.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

# SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. House Amendment No. 1 is merely a technical cleanup amendment that was put on in the House, and I -- I move that the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 407. 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 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 407. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 497. Luft. Senate Bill 4-9-7. 6-2-9. Senator Marovitz. 658. Senate Bill 658. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 658.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you -- thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 -- I -- well, I would move that the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 658. Amendment No. 1 clarifies that the estate of a parent may be obligated to pay child support for educational expenses and applies to standards -- and applies to standards for custody, joint custody, or visitation set forth in the marriage and dissolution of marriage action brought onto the Parentage Act. Basically, that's -- that's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Marovitz, is this the bill that had the -- that -- that a parent could -- someone could claim to have someone as a parent from now until eternity? That was -- that language was taken out, or was that in another bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

That is a different bill. I have agreed with you in opposing that position. I have made sure that that's been taken out of the bill. I don't think that's the right way to go either. That's very disruptive of families, but that wasn't in this bill anyway. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 658. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 658. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 659. Marovitz. Mr. Secretary, Senate Bill 659.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 659.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz. Take your time.

#### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

So, did you have a good time last night? I would move that the Senate not concur with House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 659.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz moves that the Senate ...

# SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Conference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

-- moves to non-concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 659. All in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 7-1-7. Senator Marovitz. Did you have a good time last night? Senate Bill 7-1-7. Senator Marovitz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 717.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz.

#### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I will move that the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 717. It basically amends the Principal and Income

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Act to address technical difficulties, and that's all it does. The Bar Association supports this, and I would move that we concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there a discussion? If not, the question is shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 717. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 717. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you arise?

#### SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Mr. President, I apologize, but I have to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which we receded from ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Why don't you just file it here, and we'll get to it when we get down the rest of the Calendar. All right. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 750. Senator Joyce. Senate Bill 750, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 750.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would non-concur with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Joyce moves that the Senate -- moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 750. Those in

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 838. Senator Lechowicz. 843. 9-0-8. Bottom of Page 15 is Senate Bill 908, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 9-0-8.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Lechowicz.

#### SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

I move that the Senate do not concur in House Amendment No. 1 and ask for a conference committee to be appointed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 908. Discussion? Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 16. 961. Senator Joyce. Mr. Secretary, Senate Bill 961.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 961.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President, I would move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Joyce moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 961. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 989. Senator Joyce. Senator Joyce. 989. 1023. Senator Carroll. Senate Bill 1023, Mr. Secretary.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1023.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that the Senate do concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1023. This is the Comprehensive Health Insurance Act provision suggested by its Board, and would make permanent the prohibition we had previously sponsored as a temporary one to eliminate the issue of dumping. I would answer any questions and move that we do concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1023. 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 55, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1023. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1310. Schuneman. Schuneman. Senator Schuneman. 1310. Mr. -- Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1310.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman. Take it out of the record. One out of two. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I was trying to remember what we needed to do to that. I need to non-concur on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Well, just a moment. We took it out of the record. Let's put it --

# SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Let's put it back in the record. Your --

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

That'll be good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Your principal advisor there in front's probably confusing you - Senator Raica. Senate Bill 1310, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1310.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

# SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the bill that was intended to adopt the language that Senator Berman asked for earlier. I move to non-concur with House amendment --

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

No. 2.

#### SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

No. 2.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman moves to non-concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1310. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. 1345. Cullerton. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence is Senate Bill 1345, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1345.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I would move to concur with House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill What -- what the amendments do is to extend the Illinois 1345. income tax surcharge for two years, which is expected to will - expire midnight on Sunday if we don't pass it. maintains the current distribution of the income tax proceeds, that fifty percent would go to the local governments and fifty percent going to the Educational Assistance Fund. provides an income tax -- property tax deduction, but it makes it graduated according to income. This also would be for two years only, and it reverts to a single deduction beginning in taxable year 1993. It also contains what's been described as a family first program, which has three components. Basically, these components are different forms of tax relief, which are financed in part by the graduation of the property tax deduction. There will be an additional exemption for each dependent child under eighteen years of age. There will be a State earned income tax credit equal to five percent of the Federal earned income tax credit.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator Cullerton. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we take our conferences off the Floor. Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. As I -- as I was saying, it also grants renters an income tax credit equal to three percent of their average monthly rent, up to a rent of one thousand dollars. So that the most that the credit could be is thirty dollars. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for an Aye vote.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Fawell.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

## SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I -- I -- I hope everybody is listening to what this bill is. This is the "family first" income tax plan that Senator -- that Representative - and I guess we could call him Senator and Governor Madigan has decided to come up with. I don't see that it really does much, except that it puts us in the hole three point nine million dollars even more. I see nothing about this plan that gets us out of the difficulty we have found ourselves in. I think this is an extremely bad idea, and I don't think that we should be talking about doing nothing but getting further and further and further into the -- into the depths of poverty where we seem to be digging ourselves. This is how Congress got in the mess they got into. I would strongly suggest that everybody vote No before we find ourselves borrowing to the hilt and never getting out of this morass that we are in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson. SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, would you consider taking this out of the record for now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Not right now, no. I'd like to keep it in the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Frankly, I think if any of us have any hope of seeing our homes in July, we probably ought to start facing a few of these issues and have a few roll calls. I think many of us have very serious problems with this proposal and would like to get it behind us so that we can get down, hopefully, to some meaningful

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

negotiations. Let me suggest to you that, for a large portion of this State, this bill is not only not helpful, it is very harmful - harmful in a couple of ways. First, it -- it kills any chances - its passage would at least - of any meaningful control on property taxes. Obviously, those of us who are concerned about property taxes and the dramatic increases that we've seen in -- in a large portion of the State know that without tying that to this proposal or to the continuation of the surcharge, that that's not going to happen. Secondly, this is a two-year temporary bill. do not see what good public policy is met with a temporary income tax. The problems that the money derived by the income address are not temporary in nature - they are permanent. going to be with us, I suspect, for the rest of our political lives at the very least. But I think the thing that bothers most about it is that because it kills the property tax cap possibilities, eliminates the double deductions, it is literally killing the American dream of individual home ownership. bill will make it more difficult for your children and your grandchildren to ever own a home in Illinois. I don't think we want Illinois to be an endless series of little ticky-tacky apartment buildings. I think we believe in the American dream and the dream of individual home ownership. And this bill dramatic blow to that dream.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. WGN-TV and WAND and a score of others have sought leave to record the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Geo~Karis.

## SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, one of the flaws in this bill is that it really provides, by an insidious method, a graduated income tax, which is unconstitutional under our Constitution, because it has different rates - different

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

income. The other point is that this bill is targeted to taxpayers that make ten thousand dollars or less. The taxpayers that make ten thousand dollars or less do not have to pay federal or State income tax. So what happens to the middle class? The middle class is not helped. For example, a family of four with two children that pays property taxes with adjusted gross incomes between thirty-five thousand and seventy-five thousand dollars, under this bill, would save fifteen dollars a year. 1-5. Fifteen dollars a year under the "families first" proposal. family of four would save an average of seventy-five dollars under the Property Tax Limitation Act that we passed here in the Senate. And there's a big difference. And this -- this bill does not help. We are committed here to give some property tax -- property tax relief to our constituents. We are just playing around with people's lives in order to have a proposal that sounds good -"family first." It's not families first. As a matter of fact, this proposal should be called families last and consideration last for the middle class of America and of Illinois. class is carrying the freight in this State. What are we doing about them? Playing games. Let's stop playing games and vote against this silly bill, because it certainly does not help the middle class of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, this bill doesn't include some of the things that I think are necessary. It -- it doesn't make the income tax increase permanent, which I have been for ever since the inception of the temporary surcharge. And it sure doesn't take care of our -- our problems that we have with our health care providers. And there's a couple other compromises that are floating around out here that I think could incorporate

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

some of these areas and make this particular bill a lot better. One area of disagreement that I do have and one thing I do like about the bill - it doesn't include the automatic property tax increases that we seem to want to have by putting on what we call property tax relief, which, in fact, is a property tax increase guarantee. And I'm glad that this bill doesn't include that, but I really just think that we should wait on this bill, that we should sit around and have some discussion and ensure that we do something to take care of not only our cities and our State but also our providers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Rigney. SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, Mr. President, if there's one thing we've been good at in years gone by, it's frittering away fifteen, twenty million dollars here or there somewhere along the way. This carries on our long tradition of frittering away insignificant amounts of money that, over the years, add up to some things that are rather significant. We -- we're continuing that tradition without really helping anyone. You talk about an extra deduction, exemption for children - an extra twenty-five percent. That -that translates into seven dollars and fifty cents per kid, as long -- just -- you know -- on the grounds that somehow we are saving the Illinois family by giving them an extra seven dollars and fifty cents of tax relief; the renters - an extra thirty dollars, just as if thirty dollars were a significant amount of money. Well, the problem is that when you add it all together for some of these various tax relief schemes, we're giving away another forty, fifty million dollars in a year that we obviously not have it. We can't afford to play the old fritter away game. The -- the time for that has passed. It's no fashion. And I think we've got to face that fact. And then, in

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

closing, I would merely point out that the Governor is asking for a part of that surcharge money that has gone to the cities for the last couple of years. We've got to have that, too. I don't think we can deny it. We read the headlines here a couple of days ago that said we're in the hole another three hundred and eighty-five million dollars. And we today are going to stand here, on the 29th day of June, and take away another hundred and sixty or seventy million dollars that the Governor had been anticipating in his budget? Hey, we can't afford that either. It's a bad, ill-timed piece of legislation, and I think the quicker we give it a quick burial, the quicker we can get on to the serious business about balancing this budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Thomas Dunn.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question is whether or not this really helps the poor and whether or not it helps working I've looked at the chart that reflects that for a family of four for thirty-five thousand dollars, they're going to save thirty-three dollars. I tell you what - a family of four going to McDonald's can probably spend that in one breakfast. family of four for fifty thousand dollars will save the grand sum of fifteen dollars. We all know that everybody wants more money down here, but I'll tell you one class of people that's not getting more money - and that's the residential real estate taxpayer. They've been left out. Why can't we give more relief to those people - the people that pay the most for all benefits? It's because this has become a regional issue. because the people in the City of Chicago pay sixteen percent, and the people downstate pay thirty-three percent. It's people downstate have not had high EAVs like the people have in the collar counties. We've experienced obscene - yes, obscene -

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

rates and charges to live in our own homes. And, of course, the result in the collar county is that, as we give up money, schools need more money. We lose in the formula. And who picks up the tab? The residential real estate people pick up the tab. This bill would end the double deduction in two years. relief? I don't think so. I think that the people of the ought to be asked who would rather have the money residential real estate taxpayer or give the money to GRF when we get rid of that deduction in two years. Is this relief for social security recipients living in their home, working all their lives, trying to pay their -- their mortgage and real estate tax bill? No, it's not. Is this going to encourage young marrieds to buy a home and lower the rates they're going to pay in taxes to get that home? No, it's not. Does this promote the American dream? it does not. It's time to bite the bullet and to recognize that in the collar counties, we have a very serious problem in real estate taxes. We understand that the rest of the State doesn't It's somewhat analogous to necessarily share in that. control. The people that buy guns in the City of Chicago are not hunting pheasants. It's time to do something about taxes for the little person who occupies the home. We ought not to vote for this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this bill for most of the reasons stated by the last speaker. However, there are some good provisions about this bill, and I think the best of all, it's -- it extends the income tax surcharge. But that's just not enough. If we are really serious about giving some tax relief to those people who've been carrying the burden in this State for years - the tax burden - then we

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

most certainly, considered more seriously the amendment introduced by myself and Senator Rigney on the other side of the aisle, because it did, in fact. Not only did it give some tax relief to those people who is at the bottom of the income level and shift the burden and more responsibility to those who can't afford to pay but who have not paid their fare share of taxes in this State, it also had a positive revenue advantage, because it allowed for an additional sixty million dollars in income for this State that we could have used for human services and some other programs which we are so desperately in need of money for. This bill is about nothing. It's really a game that we are pretending to give some relief to the poor and to the people in this State - taxpayers. But it really doesn't do anything, and it's been said very well. And for that reason, I'm opposed to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor will -- indicates he will yield. Senator Jones. SENATOR JONES:

Senator Cullerton, you know this has been a grave concern of mine because of what I have read in the media as it relate to the Educational Fund taking a hit. Now, I know these funds go into the distributive fund that was created two years ago, but is there any way that one could - after -- if this bill became law, that one could raid the Educational Fund?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

No. It's -- retains the money in that Fund, just as it has

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

for the last two years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

## SENATOR JONES:

So, therefore, it could be similar to the Lottery then - the funds would come in here, but they could be taken away at the other end, be it through the -- through the formula or the resource equalizer or some of the categorical grants. So, therefore, on one hand, we said we'd give them money. On the other hand, it's being taken away. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

There's nothing in this bill that takes that money away. What this bill does is to raise the money to put into the Fund in the first place. It raises it by extending the surcharge which is scheduled to expire midnight tomorrow night.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

## SENATOR JONES:

Well, let me address the bill. Two years ago, we had this bill before us. It is not the only train in town. I want to make that crystal clear. The needs of the children in the State of Illinois are permanent needs. Education is a labor-intensive industry. If you are talking about doing something, you cannot give a temporary pay raise and then come back two years later and take it away. It just does not work. If you are talking about solving the problem and bringing Illinois up, this matter should be increased, not decreased. I don't like being placed in the position where you're going to pit the children of our public school system against those who need other social programs. These issues must be addressed equally. To pass this bill in this form

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

without additional revenue, we are only fooling the people of Illinois and particularly those who rely on our public school system. So at this stage, it's not the only train in town, because the train cannot leave without all the individuals on board. And at this stage, I cannot be on board, because we have not made a real commitment to the children of the public schools in this State, in particular, the City of Chicago, where I reside. And so I -- I -- at this time, I request that you vote Present or vote No on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Topinka. SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President, I'd like to call the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Topinka, you were the last speaker. Further discussion? If not, Senator Cullerton may close.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Let me just make a few points - perhaps some clarification. With regard to the double deduction on our income tax forms that we now have - it's a double deduction of our property taxes, the -- the fact is that the second half of that deduction - the double part of that deduction - schedules to expire as well on Sunday. So there will be no double deduction. There will only be a single deduction on our income taxes -- tax forms if we were to not pass this bill. And so the "family first" portion of this bill, along with a graduated exemption, is what is being used to pay for that "family first" portion. The -- the fact of the matter is, with regard to education, this money is raised through this tax. The money goes in the Education Assistance Fund. With regard to the fact that it's temporary - I know some people wish that it be permanent - the fact is that the distribution of the money -- the distribution

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

of the money is the thing that perhaps that should not be permanent. The Governor himself, when he campaigned, said that he was for extending the surcharge, but he didn't tell anybody that he was planning on taking a hundred fifty million dollars of the money that goes to the local governments and giving it to the State. So he himself changed his mind with regard to the distribution. So perhaps it makes sense for us to have a temporary income tax surcharge. So I think this is the only game in town. And I think it's time that we realize we're going to have to extend the surcharge. This is the only bill that the House has passed. This is before us. Let's get on the bill. Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1345. 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 18, the Nays are 41, none voting Present. The Senate does not concur. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Mr. President, I ask that this motion be put on Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Postponed Consideration is granted. Senate Bill 1455. Senator Rock. Senator Rock moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 -- I'm sorry. Senate Bill 1455, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1455.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock moves to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1455. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Jones.

## SENATOR JONES:

On the previous bill that the vote went down on, I know it's a courtesy of the sponsor to give him the request for a postponed consideration, but if he wanted to send a message back to the House that we non-concur in this bill so that we can really address the issue, then is -- is a motion proper at this time? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, yes. The -- it's also covered in our rules. Rule 22 provides that a sponsor may put his -- his bill or his motion on Postponed Consideration at any time, and he did. Senator Jones. SENATOR JONES:

Well, what I'm saying -- what I'm saying to you -- this -- then -- that I would rather see the Senate non-concur.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Jones, that may be your prerogative. There's a lot of other people that have a different viewpoint. The fact of the matter is that it is covered in our rules. We have always abided by it as long as you have been down here, as long as I have been down here, and it is — it is covered. So, you know. What — what more can I say? Senator Jones.

### SENATOR JONES:

Well, I would -- I would like to see a vote on the Postponed Consideration Motion.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator -- Senator Jones, we're no longer on that Order of business. Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Supplemental Calendar 1. On the -- on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, is Senate Bill 45, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 45.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schaffer, what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Parliamentary Inquiry. What action is necessary to accomplish Senator Jones' idea?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Haven't any idea. It's not covered under our rules, Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I would ask that we concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 45. House Amendment No. 1 begins what is going to probably be very painful road that we are all going to be on as we try and balance this budget. This particular amendment, which sponsored by Speaker Madigan and Minority Leader Daniels in the House, and was agreed to there between the two leaders, would save the State 384.5 million dollars by making various cuts in a number of programs in the State. A number of these cuts would be annual, in that they would be a savings, you know, henceforth. Ιt probably the first attempt to really and truly try and face the fact that we, you know, are in the hole. Today in today's newspapers, Comptroller Netsch has dutifully announced that she is acknowledging that the State has probably entered into a recession. The monies that are coming into this State are flat. It would not seem that through natural growth, or through the collection of taxes which are out there now, that we are going be able to bail ourselves out in any other way but basically facing up to the fact that we have overspent, you know, we are

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

this deadlock. We're not paying our bills. And this is indeed what Amendment No. 1 does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there a discussion? Senator Jones. Is there a discussion? If not -- all right. Well, I -- I -- I asked three times. Senator Lechowicz.

## SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Sorry, Mr. President. I thought my light was on. I may -you may have missed it. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question or
two.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Lechowicz.

## SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

In this proposal that was adopted by the House, is there a four-hundred-dollar cap for senior citizens as far as the expenditure on medicine?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

## SENATOR TOPINKA:

There -- yes, there is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

# SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you really better start realizing what's in some of these great House amendments. Thank you, Mr. President. I would hope that this Body would start realizing what's in some of these great House amendments. Under this amendment, as far as this supposed seven-million-dollar aggregate cut, in -- under this proposal, the senior citizens of this State could only have a four-hundred-dollar cap for a total year in medical prescriptions. I think that's absolutely outrageous. For that reason alone, this amendment should be

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

defeated. And I would ask that the sponsors, when they move the adoption of these great House amendments, would give the rest of this Body a more detailed breakdown exactly what's covered. There are thirteen different expenditure items in this amendment which should be brought to the attention of this Senate Floor. But when you're — talking about taking care of senior citizens of this State, this amendment is horrendous, and it deserves an absolute No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further Discussion? Senator Collins. SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. am really glad that you -- Senator Lechowicz got you attention here, because, you know, we just shouldn't be voting on things here without time to look at it. This bill, I understand, the House last night - Senate Bill 45 - and this is an agreement, I understand, between the Speaker and, I assume, the Governor's Office to -- as to what's going to be cut out of the various human service -- mostly -- a lot of this stuff is cut out of human service. And we have not had an opportunity to -- to this, because no one know anything -- knew anything about it until it got over here this morning. It just passed the House last And if you don't know what's in it, before you vote for it, I -- I would suggest that we take it out of the record so that people can have time to look -- look at it. Because what it does - in addition to what Senator Lechowicz indicated - it gets rid of the -- the entire Advocacy Program; it cuts DASA - a tremendous cut in that program and the Nursing Home Assistance Program and on and on down the line. And these programs are -- I understand are very important to us that we have fought over the years. and if we are going to cut, we ought to talk about cutting across the board so that those critical human service areas will not take

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

the brunt of all of the cuts. And -- and I just think we should defeat this amendment, and we should tell Madigan and Lee Daniels that we are all elected representatives down here, and they just don't cut deals, and they don't make decisions without our input. So I think we should defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

### SENATOR FAWELL:

Well, I think if -- if we all start really looking at -- at what some of this is doing, I think some of the things they're doing are -- are not as bad as some of the cuts we may have to even make later. We'd better realize that -- that one-third of our General Revenue Fund right now goes to Public Aid. Two-thirds of that one-third goes to nursing homes, institutions, One-third goes to education. And about twenty-two percent go to prisons and judiciary system, State Police, and -and DCFS and Mental Health. None of these cuts are going to be easy ones for us to make. We're going to have to start cutting in -- in things like Children and Family Service, which, obviously, none of us want to do. But if you read it, it says that it's going to eliminate services to wards over nineteen years of age. That means we will still be able to take care of the children from birth to eighteen years. It's the nineteen-, twenty-, twenty-one-year-old that we are no longer calling a child. Frankly, I was married when I was nineteen and then had a child by the time I was twenty. So I'm not real sure that I would still be considered a -- a child at that point. There's some other things that they are allowing us to do. I think we ought to seriously look at this amendment and then vote for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

you, Mr. President. You know, you listen to this debate, and both sides make sense, because first of all, we need to make some cuts. But let me give you a couple of areas where I think we have a real problem, notwithstanding the pharmaceutical assistance, which is atrocious to think we're going take or care -- those health benefits from our seniors. let me read you what our analysis says on the Prompt Payment Act. And I'm going to try to emphasize a couple of words. Documents applied by the Speaker's Office suggest that the 173.5 million will be saved by manipulation of the payment cycle beyond the sixty-day prompt payment required. Additionally, 59.5 million would also be saved in interest payments for failure to meet the Prompt Payment Act requirements. What the hell? We're -- we're asking ourselves to break our own law on this thing, and I think it's ridiculous, and I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Topinka may close. SENATOR TOPINKA:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, when I started this discussion, I said that nobody would be happy with this, and this would be the first step in what would be a very painful journey in trying to balance a budget that has been consistently overspent. We are not getting new dollars in because of -- of what Comptroller Netsch says is -- is the beginning - really hard and fast - of a recession for the State of Illinois. I don't think anybody in this State is going to be exempt from --

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

## SENATOR TOPINKA:

-- taking a hit in some form or another on programs and proposals and things that they have come to know and love, and in many cases depend on. It is not an easy vote to make, but let me suggest, in terms of what may be down the line, this may be one of the easier votes that we have to do in balancing the budget. And I would ask for your concurrence.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 45. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Last call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 31, none voting Present. The motion fails, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence. House Bill 1431, Madam Secretary, please.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1431.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1982. Luft. House Bill 1982, Madam Secretary.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1982.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

## SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 and ask for a conference committee...on House Bill 1982.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Senator Luft moves -- I'm sorry. Senator Luft moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1982. And the bill -- I'm sorry -- and that a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. With leave of the Body, we'll do resolutions. Resolutions.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 630 offered by Senators Weaver and Woodyard. It is congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Resolution 632 <sic> (633) offered by Senators Hall, Ralph Dunn and Frank Watson.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Executive. All right. Senator Rock.

## SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, in the inevitable paper chase, we seem to have caught up. And so I would suggest that to afford everyone an opportunity to make some phone calls, there is a meeting of the appropriations folks, I'm told, at noon. And other conference committees are beginning to form, so I would suggest we stand in recess until 1:30.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 1:30.

(RECESS)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

## (SENATE RECONVENES)

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senate will please come to order. Supplemental Calendar No. 2 has been distributed. You will notice that they are all House bills that are back on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence in Senate amendments. These are, however, all the appropriation bills, and I understand the conferees are still meeting. So that — that Calendar will not be addressed today. Messages from the House, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to recede from their amendments to a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill No. 42.

I am further directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representative requests a First Committee of Conference to consider the differences of the two Houses in regards to the amendments to their bill.

Action taken by the House, June 28, 1991.

## I have like Messages on:

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 62;

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 249;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 250;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 271:

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 307;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 326;

House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 446;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 453;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 499;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 616;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 631;

## 54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 654; House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 678; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 697; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 699; House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 708; House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 728; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 741: House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 774; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 872: House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 907; House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 923; House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 992; House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1030; House Amendments 1 to Senate Bill 1031; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1042; House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1079; House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1147; House Amendments 1 through 6 and 8 to Senate Bill 1171; House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1182; House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1218; House Amendment -- House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1303;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1329;

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1393;

And House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1451.

Action taken by the House, June 28, 1991.

### PRESIDENT ROCK:

1295;

All right. Those were requests for conference committees made by the House. Senator Demuzio moves that the Senate does accede to the request of the House with respect to those bills. Messages from the House.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 319 with Senate Amendment No. 1.

## I have like Messages on:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 373;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 376:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 378;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 384;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 393;

Senate Amendments 1 to House Bill 395;

Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 505;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5-4-5;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5-8-1:

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to -- to House Bill 629;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 631;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 633;

Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 634;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 636;

Senate Amendments 1 through 6 to House Bill 637;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 639;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 640;

Senate Amendments 1 through 7 to House Bill 641;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 642;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 643;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 644;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 645;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 646;

Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 647;

# 54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

```
Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 649;
Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 650:
```

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 652;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 654;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 655;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 656;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 657;

Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 658;

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 659:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 660;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 736;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 737:

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 808;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 887;

Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 to House Bill 888;

Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1048;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1101;

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1155;

And Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1296.

Non-concurred in by the House, June 29, 1991.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Secretary's Desk, Concurrence. Senate will come to order. Page 8. House Bills 2nd Reading, Madam Secretary, is House Bill 1354. Read the bill, please.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1354.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Rock offers Amendment No. 1.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

### SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1354 is a change in the map as voted upon by the House of Representatives. In our judgment, we have made some changes, particularly on the southeast side of the City of Chicago and the County of Cook, to better reflect the existing population and the population movement and to make the map, if possible, even more compact, contiguous, and obviously, substantially equal in population. In addition, this amendment makes about four or five technical changes, correcting either typographical errors or -- or numbers that were transposed. I know of no objection to the amendment, and I would move its adoption.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Discussion? Senator Watson.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you. I'm surprised to hear that there's no objection, since we just received this amendment on our desk - time being 2:50 in the afternoon of June 29th, and I object and ask that this amendment and legislation be taken out of the record until we have an opportunity to review the amendment and get a proper status as to what it actually does.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Dudycz. Senator Watson.

# SENATOR WATSON:

Request of the sponsor that this bill be taken out of the record until we get an opportunity to review the amendment. This has just been placed on our desks - this particular time. We

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

haven't had an -- haven't had an opportunity to look it over, and I think it ought to be taken out of the record until we get that opportunity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

#### SENATOR ROCK:

Well, the Gentleman is speaking as though this were somehow final action. This is an amendment on 2nd Reading, and when adopted — and it does no more than I said it did — no less, but no more. It pertains to four or five districts on the southeast side of the City of Chicago and the County of Cook. It makes some other minor technical changes. That's all it does. And this is not final action. It is to put the bill in the shape in which the sponsor wishes to have it so that we can call it for final action tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I'd like to remind the Membership that this is a map which is going to take effect for the next ten years. It's not just something that we need to take idly by and stand here and let this be crammed down our throats. And that's exactly what's happening here. This amendment's just now being distributed. Under Rule 15 of our own rules here in the Illinois Senate, it says that an amendment should be distributed and given — the Members ample opportunity to look the amendment over, know what's in it before the — before the amendment proceeds. So I persist in my objection and would like to have this legislation taken out of the record so we can review the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Well, we'll get back to you.

SENATOR WATSON:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Well --

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz, discussion? Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, obviously, this is going to be crammed down, or at least an attempt to cram through -- down our throats, and we want to let you know that we object to that. We don't think that this is in the best interest of the people, and that an ample opportunity should be given us and the people to review the amendment and discuss the amendment in a proper forum. Having said that, I do have --

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR ROCK:

A point of order. I hope nobody is under the misapprehension that -- that this is somehow something totally brand new. I conferred with your Minority Leader and did, in fact, present him a copy of an amendment to Senate Bill 52 a week or ten days ago, along with the accompanying configuration. And what I suggest to you, my friend, is that Amendment No. 1 makes only minuscule changes in a certain small portion of this State. You've had the information for better than a week, to my knowledge. And I would persist and ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Well then, Senator, why was it just distributed now? Why wasn't it distributed earlier so we would have had -- each Member had an ample opportunity to review it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Dudycz. SENATOR WATSON:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. I would like to proceed with some questions of the sponsor, on the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Speaker Madigan said in House debate that he believes that the proposal satisfies the Voters' Rights Act. Do you believe that this amendment that we have before us also satisfies that Voters' Rights Act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Speaker Madigan's map contained fifteen statewide House Districts with Black or Afro-American populations over sixty-five percent and with a Afro-American population of over thirty to sixty-five percent. How many Afro-American House Districts over sixty-five percent Afro-American population does this amendment contain?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Six.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further -- Senator Watson.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

SENATOR WATSON:

How many with an Afro-American population of thirty to sixty-five percent does this amendment contain?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

One.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Does this amendment affect any House District with an Hispanic population of thirty to sixty-five percent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Does it affect a House District with an Hispanic population of over sixty-five percent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Have you obtained any opinions or analysis from political scientists or other experts as to this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

### SENATOR ROCK:

I -- there was a point at which I thought I might qualify for that distinction, but I'm -- so the direct answer to your direct question is, aside from my colleagues, all of whom are eminent political scientists, the answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

When you prepared this amendment, did you confer with any -- or obtain input from any minority groups?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. Well, who were they?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

My colleagues on this side of the aisle.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No one, then, from outside this Chamber or the Membership of this Chamber?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

You are speaking specifically to the amendment now, as I -- I assume.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

We have had discussions, yes, with -- with others, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Would you please identify whom others might be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I think that's a matter of confidence. If they wish to come forward, they're certainly entitled to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

So, you're not going to identify what minority groups have participated in the preparation of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I thought I already did. And I would ask the Ladies and Gentlemen with whom I conferred to stand, if they so wish. But they're seated here on the Floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I was specifically referring to the outside groups.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I was waiting for a response.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I thought I responded admirably. You know, I'm not -- what are you getting at, may I ask?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, certainly. The -- I would like to know - and for you to identify - what outside minority groups participated in the preparation of this amendment. Simple question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I drew up this amendment, with the help of my colleagues.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I guess I'm to assume then that there wasn't any assistance from outside groups.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

You draw any assumption or inference you wish.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Under the amendment we just received, there is a map enclosed,

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

and I would like to refer to that map, if I could. On House District 25, and this is Senate Amendment to House Bill 1354 - the map that you just now had distributed - can you tell me what the percentage of Afro-Americans live in House District 25?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Fifty-five percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I'm sorry. Fifty-five percent? 5-5? And that is the Afro-American population? I would like the record to show. Would you please respond?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

For one who has not had adequate time to see this thing, you certainly are getting pretty specific. The answer is that the percentage of African-Americans in the 25th District is fifty-five percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

What about the Hispanic makeup of that district? Could you give me that information, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR WATSON:

We need to have this information, because we just got the -- PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

SENATOR ROCK:

In the 25th House District, the percentage of Hispanic-Americans is 28.41 percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Can you tell me - does that constitute a super-majority?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Does which number constitute a super-majority?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

A combination of the two, if that's what you're doing here to assume that this district is a super-majority district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, I'm afraid you're going to have to define your terms. My understanding of a super-majority district is one that is in excess of sixty-five percent of a single ethnic population. This district would not fit in that definition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I guess we're to assume, then, that this is not a supermajority district, and it's an influential district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I think it's fair to say that it is influenced by the

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Hispanics - no question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz. Senator Watson? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Did the map that came over here -- the bill -- the actual legislation we're trying to amend have more super-majority House districts in it than we will have after this amendment is attached?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

You're specifically referring to the County of Cook, I assume?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Your amendment and how it impacts the legislation that's before us now - 1354 - how your amendment will impact the supermajority districts - numberwise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No impact.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I thank the President of the Senate for giving me the opportunity to ask some questions. I do have some concerns, however, in the manner in which this amendment was placed on our desk in a -- inappropriate time, for all of us to have the opportunity to digest its content and know the impact. And as a result of that, I think the proper vote on this particular

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

amendment is No, and I certainly would ask for a roll call at the appropriate time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have a few questions for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Rock, are you aware of the Chicago Urban League's plan with sixteen statewide African-American House districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I am aware.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudvcz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Did you incorporate any parts of that plan into this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

My recollection is that that plan was considered, along with a number of other proposals, at the committee level by Senator Alexander and her group. So, indirectly, yes, all those -- all those proposals were considered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Can you tell us what portions of those plans were incorporated

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

in this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock,

SENATOR ROCK:

In this amendment? None.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Did you specifically solicit the Urban League or any other minority group in preparing this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further -- Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Rock, do you believe this amendment is politically fair?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Have you determined the political makeup of the affected districts with the addition of this amendment, specifically the majority Democrat versus the majority Republican?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

That was not my primary consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

But, Senator, did you determine the political makeup? Even though it may not have been your primary consideration, was it any consideration whatsoever to the makeup of the affected district, the Democrat majority versus the Republican majority districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

It was a consideration, certainly; secondary to the primary consideration, which is the one-man/one-vote representation requirement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

To this secondary consideration, what methodology was used? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, we have -- we have been basing calculations or -- or projections of that kind predicated upon prior voting history, particularly with respect to the University of Illinois trustee races.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

What years did you -- or what year did you use?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Well, I'm not sure that's relevant to this amendment, but the fact is we used 1988 and 1990.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Did you take into account incumbency in preparation of this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I stand before you as the Majority Leader of my Party. So, a direct answer to a direct question is, yes, I did.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Rock, if you were presented with a proposal that increased the number of minority districts by one Senate and two House seats, would you consider it more constitutionally acceptable than the bill as -- as amended with this particular amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Not necessarily.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Do you have any opinion as to the minimum number of African-American House and Senate seats necessary under the Voters' Rights Act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, yes, the current number, because it is constitutionally

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

and statutorily impermissible to engage in retrogression, as you well know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator, for the proposed map, do you have any opinion as to the minimum number of African-American House and Senate seats necessary under the Voters' Rights Act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I'm sorry. I'm getting too much advice over here. Would the Gentleman mind repeating that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Specifically, Senator Rock, do you have any opinion as to the minimum number of African-American House and Senate seats necessary under the Voters' Rights Act - to the proposed map, not the current map?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, again, I can assure you we did not engage in any retrogression. So, I think the number is constant under -- under the proposal, under the amendment as proposed, and under the existing law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

What would that mean numerically, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Senator Rock.

### SENATOR ROCK:

That's a good question, and I'd be delighted to get an answer from you. What is it currently?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

## SENATOR DUDYCZ:

I'm sorry. But my question hasn't been answered. What's the -- what's the number, according to your opinion?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

### SENATOR ROCK:

Well, we have -- I don't think you have any minority Members on your side. So, I think over -- I think there are eight here currently, and I think the map, as passed by the House, would add certainly an additional Senate seat - a minority Senate seat.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further -- Senator Dudycz.

## SENATOR DUDYCZ:

What's your answer - specifically, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

# SENATOR ROCK:

I think simple addition - if it adds one Hispanic district and one minority district, plus the eight we have here, that's ten.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Dudycz.

# SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Rock, isn't or is the real purpose of this amendment to accommodate a Democrat incumbent Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Rock.

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

## SENATOR ROCK:

I think you will find that this amendment purports to create -- does create a new majority Black House district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Yes or no, Senator? Is this -- real purpose of this amendment to accommodate a Democrat incumbent Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

### SENATOR ROCK:

I think if you'll turn around, you'll find out that Senator DeAngelis was well-accommodated with this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

## SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Could you specifically answer, Senator, or are you purposely attempting to avoid answering my question? Is the real purpose of this amendment to accommodate a Democrat incumbent Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

## SENATOR ROCK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further -- Senator Dudycz.

### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I also join Senator Watson in opposing the amendment. And at the appropriate time, I would ask for a recorded roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

## SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, just for the purpose of the court record, I'd like to know the handler's name who handled Watson and Dudycz. The fellow sitting in the light blue suit?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Carter Hendren.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Nice try, Walter, but the fellow next to Carter Hendren. Just for the court record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

His name is James Schirott, S-C-H-I-R-O-T-T.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Is he a practicing attorney who is advising the Republican  $\mbox{\sc Party?}$ 

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

I'm sorry. But I -- I don't know whether he is advising any party.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Let me just point out to you, when I raised the question, he nodded to the affirmative, and I want that to be recorded. And I

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

want to know what he's doing on the Floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

We're coming right back to you. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

A point of order, Mr. President. It's not my amendment. We are debating the amendment. And I think we should go to the business of voting on the amendment or discussing the amendment. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock may close.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I urge the adoption of Amendment No. 1. In my judgment, it makes a good map better, and I think it deserves a vote from all of us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1354. All 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 31, the Nays are 28, none voting Present. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 1357, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 1357.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

54th Legislative Day

June 29, 1991

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. With leave of the Body, we'll go to the Order of Resolutions. Resolutions.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 6-3-4 offered by Senator Topinka.

And Senate Resolution 6-3-5 offered by Senator Marovitz.

They're congratulatory and death resolutions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. Senator Rock. What purpose -- Ladies and Gentlemen -- Senator Rock.

### SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have discussed with Senator Philip the fact that we literally are at the mercy of the conferees on conference committee reports, and most particularly those who are engaged in the appropriations discussions. As you'll note, Supplemental Calendar No. 2 contains the rest of the entire State budget. These are all House Bills with our Senate amendments on them. And so rather than have everybody sitting around, I'd prefer to have those who are dealing with the appropriations return to their chore, and all of us who have conference committees, get about the business. So I would move we stand adjourned until one o'clock tomorrow. One o'clock on Sunday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senate stands adjourned till -- till one o'clock tomorrow.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

## STATE OF ILLINGIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

92/03/12 14:27:51

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 29, 1991

HB-0070	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	16
HB-0114	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	17
HB-0703	RECEDE	PAGE	17
H8-1171	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	18
HB-1183	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	18
HB-1354	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
HB-1357	SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	78
H5-1431	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	53
H8-1528	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	19
	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	19
	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	20
HB-1982	REFUSE TO RECEDE REFUSE TO RECEDE NON-CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
H8-2491	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	20
SB-0045	NON-CONCURRENCÉ	PAGE	47
SB-0131	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
\$8-0151	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
SB-0158	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG€	22
SB-0267	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
SB-04 07	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
SB-0656	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
S8-0659	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
SB-0717	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
SB-0750	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32
SB-0908	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	33
SB-0961	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	33
\$8-1023	CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	33
SB-1310	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
SB-1310	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	34
58-1345	DISCUSSED	PAGE	47
	DISCUSSED AND POSTPONED		35
SB-1455	NON-CONCURRENCE RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	46
		PAGE	54
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
_	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	.3
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	54
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	79
SR-0635	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	79

# SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER - PRESIDENT ROCK	PAGE	ı
PRAYER - REVEREND BOB HANSON	PAGE	1
JOURNAL - APPROVED }	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - POSTPONED	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
EXECUTIVE SESSION - CONSIDER APPOINTMENTS	PAGE	3
INTRODUCTION OF GUEST - SENATOR VADALABENE	PAGE	16
REMARKS BY LAUNA ARRINGTON	PAGE	16
RECESS	PAGE	54
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	55
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	55
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	79