67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The hour of eight-thirty having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will our Members please rise, and our friends in the gallery please rise for the prayer. The prayer today will be by Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

(Prayer given by Senator Geo-Karis)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Wednesday, June 23rd, in the year 1993, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journal.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Dudycz moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Messages from the House.

## SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 54.

Adopted by the House, June 23rd, 1993. It's congratulatory. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar. Committee Reports.

## SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: To the Committee on Appropriations, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5; to the Committee on Environment and Energy,

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Conference Committee Report on House bill 1163; and to the Executive Committee, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 282.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

For the benefit of the Members, we plan on standing at ease until one o'clock, to allow the committees to meet and take up the business of amendments. And I would hope that we would probably go to 3rd Readings, and pass a few bills, and get out of here, I would hope by early afternoon. ...(microphone cutoff)...Butler.

### SENATOR BUTLER:

This is an announcement that the Commerce and Industry Committee will not -- will not meet today.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Butler. Senator Hawkinson, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR HAWKINSON:

For purposes of an announcement, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Make your announcement.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

There will be no -- I repeat, no Judiciary Committee meeting today, which was originally scheduled for 9:30 this morning. I suspect we will have it on Monday instead. There will be no Judiciary today.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Hawkinson. Senator Topinka...

## SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr...

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

..what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR TOPINKA:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, there will be no Public Health and Welfare Committee meeting today. It

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

has been canceled.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Topinka. Senator DeAngelis. What purpose do you arise?

#### SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Just for the purpose of an announcement, Mr. President. The Revenue Committee will not convene today. We will probably convene Monday.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator DeAngelis. Senator Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR MADIGAN:

May I — thank you, Mr. President. May I echo the same remarks about the Insurance Committee, insofar as that meeting at 10:30. It will not meet.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Madigan. Here we go, one more. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you arise?

# SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Same purpose - the Education meeting which was scheduled for 9:30 over in the Stratton Office Building in A-1 - that meeting has been cancelled also.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Watson. Senator Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to also announce the State Government and Executive Appointments Committee will not meet today; we may meet Monday.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Dunn. Senator Dudycz, for what purpose do you arise?

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I've been informed by the Chairman of the Local Government and Elections Committee, Senator Raica, that the Local Government and Elections Committee will not meet at 11 o'clock this morning. Will not meet.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Dudycz. Now, I -- I have been led to believe that everything is canceled except two committee hearings. Executive and Appropriations, with -- I think, are running simultaneously, at 10 o'clock today. Exec, in 212. Appropriations in Room 400. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Senator Fawell has asked to announce that the Transportation Committee has also been cancelled.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Watson. ...(microphone cutoff)...Weaver, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that Finance Committee will not meet today, also.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Weaver. If I can have your attention for one more minute, and remind everybody, Senate Executive today at 10 a.m. in Room 212. Senate Appropriations, 10 a.m., Room 400. We will stand at ease until 1 p.m.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will please come to order. Committee Reports. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Karpiel, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports that the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 899 Be Adopted.

And Senate Amendment 1 to House bill 282 Be Adopted.

And Senator Maitland, Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, reports that Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5 Be Adopted.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

... (microphone cutoff)... Resolutions.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 636, offered by Senator Jones.

It's congratulatory, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar. TV Station WCIA, Number 3, and WAND-TV requests the taping of our Session today. Is there any objections? If not, leave is granted. Messages from the House. SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 53.

Adopted by the House, June 23rd, 1993. It's congratulatory. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

### SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. Since Senator Cullerton is

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

not here, we will have a Democratic Caucus in my office, for forty-five minutes.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

For how long?

SENATOR JONES:

Until a quarter to three.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All right. That's certainly is in order. The Senate will stand at ease until a quarter to three, for a Democrat Caucus. Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Madam <sic> President. I would like to request a -- a Republican Caucus immediately in Madam President's Office.

All right, the Senate will stand at ease, by the call of the  $\operatorname{Chair}$ .

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will please come to order. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

House Joint Resolution 3.

Adopted by the House, May 26th, 1993. It's substantive.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 637, offered by Senator Rea.

And Senate Resolution 638 through 646, offered by Senator Topinka.

And Senate Joint Resolution 79, offered by Senators Hasara, Ralph Dunn and others.

They're all congratulatory and death resolutions, Mr. President. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar. WICS-TV has requested permission to videotape our Session today. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. ...(machine cutoff)...House Bills 3rd, the bottom of page 3. House Bill 5. Senator Maitland. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Senator Maitland, do you wish the bill to be returned to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? All right. Senator Maitland seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 5 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 5. Mr. Secretary, read the amendment. SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senators Maitland, Philip and Donahue.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This afternoon we are going to attempt to offer to the Body an initiative that we believe is a fiscally sound initiative, that will allow us to move forward with the Fiscal Year '94 State

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

budget, and attempt to get us out of Springfield prior 30th. This proposal that we're going to be offering this afternoon is a proposal that will affect, in a positive way, both sides of the aisle. I must admit to you, however, that it is premised on two or three things, of course, that also have to move in concert with the movement of House Bill 5. It is premised on the extension of the surcharge, and it offers to the Body an It is premised on the passage of the eighty-twenty split. cigarette tax, which will generate for the State about and eighty-five million dollars. It is premised on revenue for FY'93 in amount of fifteen billion twenty-three million the and further, it is premised on a revenue estimate of dollars, fifteen billion six hundred and forty-one million for FY'94. And we believe these figures to be realistic, and I don't think there's any disagreement on either side of the aisle, here. Let me move to some of the major portions of the amendment. It increases the funding for elementary and secondary education by a hundred forty-five million dollars, thirty-five million dollars over the Governor's introduced level. It increases higher ed by sixty or twenty-three million over the Governor's introduced level - changes that we believe are needed and necessary. increases by four hundred and twenty-six percent Healthy Moms, Healthy Kids, a program that both sides of the aisle believe is a very necessary and worthwhile program. We would suggest that we fund the super-max prison. We believe that also is necessary. Most importantly, however, I believe, it eliminates a tax that has been a burden on every Member of the General Assembly, and that's the granny tax, and all of us have agonized over this and recognized the need to replace this revenue. We do it by, first of all, passing the cigarette tax - a hundred and eighty-five million dollars; we continue the one-dollar-a-bed tax on nursing homes across this State, which generates, roughly, thirty-three

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

million dollars; and we cap COLA for FY'94. It deals with hospitals slightly differently, in that it taxes hospitals at 1.88 percent of gross revenue, minus the deficiency in Medicare. ... (microphone cutoff)...is, Ladies and Gentlemen, a sound proposal. I have touched upon only the major areas of the amendment - Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5. And I would remind the Membership, we are close to June 30th. And I I urge you - to look very carefully at this amendment, because each subsequent approach to the budget for Fiscal Year '94 will be less palatable to both sides of the aisle. Mv final point: As we worked diligently on this budget proposal, we kept in mind not only what was good for Republican Members in the House and the Senate, but we attempted to work diligently to help solve your problems on that side of the aisle, as well. We viewed it in a bipartisan way. I would hope you would do the same. Mr. President, I move the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 85 <sic> (5).

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Carroll, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR CARROLL:

For discussion on the motion, Mr. President.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Discussion on the motion?

## SENATOR CARROLL:

He's moved to adopt Amendment No. 1. I'd like to speak on the topic.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Go ahead.

### SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I won't go through all of the questions that we did in committee. Let me make, if I can, maybe, as -- as Senator Maitland has done, some broad based - and maybe,

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Senator Maitland had done also, some specifics. First of all, let me re-echo our comments of yesterday in objection objecting to the process. Unlike in prior years, when at least if plan was presented to the press, it was presented to the other side so that the staff had at least overnight to look at were presented at the time that the Rules Committee was meeting at 8:30 this morning, for the first time, an eight-hundred-page bill, be discussed in committee at 10 o'clock this morning. I don't think that's good for openness in government; I don't think good for fairness of process; and I don't think it's good for intelligent discussion on probably one of having the most important things we in the General Assembly ever do. I think, also, there's something else that has to be clarified, and what the budget does and what it doesn't do. It was claimed, in general, that this budget would do something to affect increase the deficit of State deficit. Ιt has. It will Government. Unlike the press release that indicated a potential nineteen million dollars towards the deficit, it, in fact, has taken an area that we have struggled with for the last of group insurance. How much are we going to fund for the medical care costs of State employees, and are we going those bills timely? Why, just this Session, we added twenty-one million dollars to the supplemental appropriation for Fiscal because State employees are being denied health care; because, in fact, doctors, clinics and so on, said, "Hey, the State is They're not paying their bills. You pay, and if the stiffing us. State ever pays, we'll give you the money back." So what does It takes thirty-eight million dollars out of what this plan do? suggested for group insurance, and eliminates it, the Governor adding to the State's deficit - not reducing it, but adding to it. Throughout the various agencies, you will see what the priorities If you want to look at this as a replacement for the granny

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

tax and the surtax, both of which died June 30th - they're over; is no tax July 1st. We are taking away from local governments two hundred and ten, two hundred and twenty million That's a lot of money. We are taking it away by saying dollars. we are not giving them that which they got in Fiscal 193: two hundred eleven million. The normal revenue growth, which is agreed to be thirty-eight million, the forty million dollars Governor committed to pay in Fiscal '94 and Fiscal '95, and according to the printout, instead of two hundred and eighty-nine million, we'll be giving them sixty-nine million, taking away two million dollars from municipal hundred twenty governments throughout Illinois. What does that mean to our taxpayers? One of the things we said we were going to do in a budget is some type of property tax adjustment. Well, Senate Republican plan number It raises the local property taxes by two three does that. hundred and twenty million dollars. Where do local governments get money to pay for police protection, sanitation services, and all the rest that goes into local government? Either from us or, the property tax. So, yes, the Republicans have given locals a new method of property tax, and that is to going to have to go up two hundred and twenty million dollars just to stay at the same level you would have been at this year. We can go through the specifics of the budget, and there are a lot. There are an awful lot in here, of tragic misadjustments, that I think we well identified in the committee, and I won't bore Members who weren't there, to truly repeat, now. Let's just talk about a few of them and see where the priorities really were. Philip, one of the great things you did at the beginning Senator of this Session was to say we had new rules; that dead is dead is if something gets killed, it will never surface again And during the same Session of the General Assembly. Well, Ι Senator Philip amend that statement when a Senate Republican idea

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

got killed in the House. And he said, "No, no, no. That's not dead. I only meant if it was an idea that got killed in the Senate, not something that got killed in the House." So what do we look at today? In this budget is every Republican pork project that got killed on the Senate Floor -- has resurrected - and it's not even that time of year yet, and even I know that - has resurrected in this amendment; so that dead is never dead is never dead under Senator Philip's Senate, in the General Assembly. doesn't matter if it was killed in the Senate; it is And there's a pork barrel project in here that got one vote in a Republican-controlled committee - Public Health to resurface here as an amendment in the Republican proposal, though it was dead-dead-dead when it was killed in committee with only one vote. But, funny thing - Anna is back. And it's back, though it could not survive anywhere else. Let me tell you what is important. While cutting DASA projects, they decided it was important to add little pork, by opening up an office in Aurora. So we're cutting treatment for alcoholic and substance-abuse people, to the tune of about a million and a half, so that we can open, What are we doing in Champaign? Aurora, a project. purchasing a new law building. We're purchasing the former Burnham City Hospital for renovation, for natural history. We're -- we are expanding the library, and construction of classrooms at McHenry College, in Senator Klemm's district. Not on anybody's priority list, but Senate Republican plan number three. Wasn't on Higher Ed's, or anyone else anywhere to be funded. Maybe that's how you put the votes together. That's what became a priority. We are planning and designing a dormitory at Argonne National Laboratory for an Advanced Photon Source project critical need in government, while we are cutting community services in things like Healthy Moms, Healthy Kids. We have Project Hope for a million dollars in DCFS, while we are violating

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Decree, by cutting the grants by an artificial figure. Fifteen million dollars we are cutting in grants, though we are under a federal court order under BH to be spending money, because before there was a court order, they used to lapse money. So we can cut it there but create a new program for a Republican Member. We have a downstate mass transit funding for South-Central RIDES Mass Transit. We are -- a dredging project for the DuPage Forest Preserve District and Salt Creek. For Senator Fitzgerald, they found money to fund the Schaumburg Triangle Road Study, while transferring fifteen million dollars out of the Road Fund. we once had the dastardly deed of suggesting that there was excess funds in the Road Program, everybody was down on us; the Department was there en masse to tell each Member what they would individually lose. Where were they today? Director, not one staff of any agency, including the Office of the Governor, was in committee today. First time in history that none of them were there for an Appropriations meeting. Thev were ordered, by the Governor's Office, Senator Maitland - they were ordered by the Governor's Office - not to attend, not to appear, and not to answer any questions from a Democratic Member of the Senate. Now we know why. When there was suggestions that Road Fund might be a little bit excess - horrible thing. now, you can take fifteen million, and now we see where you're spending it. Concrete slab roads for Iroquois County. That's In DCCA, a Hong Kong office - a where it's being spent. wonderfully important thing. Another couple hundred thousand for the Hong Kong office - truly important. In the Village of Leland, some extra money. And probably one of the best of all, in my opinion, while we are shorting education -- even though there's a little more money - I'm not arguing that point - they have found money because a regional superintendent in Champaign apparently absconded with a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, and the

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

was responsible. In Republican plan three, that's bank priority. We're going to make sure that bank doesn't suffer a loss, because they had to protect their accounting, and because of these funds that were suddenly, mysteriously disappearing because of the action of a regional superintendent. A hundred and twenty-five thousand gone; that became a greater priority than taking care of the people in Children and Family Services, who we are cutting the funding in the grant programs, the people in all of the other services of government where we are cutting the funding, but there's money for these pork projects. I think that it's just a little bit ludicrous to talk about this being a sound budget program. I agree it's your third program, and it's probably better than the other two. We're anxiously awaiting, though -- each time we have seen a Republican budget plan, there's been more pork -- so, Mr. President, I will close with saying we are anxiously awaiting Republican plan four, but I don't think the people of Illinois can afford it.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to speak on the matter, before the Floor.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Go right ahead.

# SENATOR HENDON:

Mr. President. I -- I Thank you, You know, spoke I've spoke up ever since I got here, about us vesterday, and receiving large volumes of information at the last moment and then Well, being asked to vote on it. that happened again morning, and I truly thought that that just wasn't going to happen in the Senate any longer, especially since the Republican Party had taken control of this Body. But it happened again this

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

President. We were handed eight-hundred-page morning, Mr. document that doesn't just have pork in it. Senator Carroll was much too kind, because nothing is wrong with -- with pork, unless you leave it out in the sun too long. This particular pork that's in this budget is soiled, is soured, is rotten That's what's wrong with this pork that's in this budget. Within this budget, we have one 4.3-million-dollar study that defeated in this Chamber. It's in here now. I say that's rotten, soiled, sour pork. Also in this document, we have one dollars were for tax increases. Now, I just want to know if you're prepared to vote for the largest tax increase in history of the State of Illinois today. If you're willing to vote for that, I want to know, how can you go back to your districts and say to the people of this State that you're going to put such heavy tax burden on them, while you got all this pork in there. All this pork. Just look up and down the list. Howard read I don't have to read the list. But it's not just normal list. I say it's soured, because at the same time, while pork. adding all of these buildings, while the Governor said he was going to put kids in front of concrete, you're cutting programs the children; you're cutting families for the future; you're cutting infant mortality; you're cutting drug-abuse counseling and programs, while you're building buildings, while you're building these roads, while you have this pork spread out across this That is wrong. That is wrong. There is no way that State. justify cuts in mental health. There's no way that you can justify cuts in -- in minority scholarships and minority teachers, while you give pay raises to professors that are alreadv enough money. That is wrong. It is wrong to do that, and there is no way that you can justify it. There is no way that you can justify raising the taxes of a billion dollars, while you at the same time cut job training programs completely out of this budget.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

There is no way you can do that and justify it. And that's why I understand you're standing there turning your back, because you may as well turn your back on this entire process. You mav as well turn your back on this budget, because it is so sour, it'll turn your nose up if you take the time and look at it, and see it for what it is. It's fat with stinking, rotten pork, while it's saying to the children of this State, "Go ahead you don't matter. We're taking away your Go ahead; little welfare; we're taking away your little Medicaid card, away your opportunity to live and make a better life for yourself." That's what you're doing. Yeah, sure, there are a few dollars in here for Healthy Moms, Healthy Kids, but they took away the money for the other programs that would get people off of aid and give children a chance to live in this city. Now, let's this State. Let's just deal briefly with the surcharge. They want to tell you that they're taking care of the cities. no, they haven't. All you're doing is shifting the burden to the cities. You're going to force the cities to make property tax increases and force the local government. All your little local governments, Ladies and Gentlemen, whether Democrat or Republican, are going to have to suffer under this Republican initiative. And as I sit down, I just want to you with one final thought - one final thought - and that is: Each and every one of you who votes for this budget, with these high tax increases in it that are unnecessary, each and every one of you that votes for this budget that is just vicious, vicious, and inhumane when it comes to children who are trying to live in this State. Each and every one of you will back to your district and say, "Look what I did." And you'll want lie and throw that clown like you're eliminating the granny tax; the granny tax sunsets June 30th anyway. So you're not doing nothing for granny; you're just raising the taxes, and you want to

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

use those little fancy words. You're not reducing the deficit; you're adding to the deficit. This is cruel and unusual punishment, and you will pay, if you vote for this today.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Hendon. Senator LaPaille, for what purpose do you arise?

#### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

To speak on the legislation, Mr. President.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Go right ahead.

### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I think there's several of you - or maybe many of you over there - that are saying, "What are we doing? What are we being asked to do here?" What are we going to be voting on that you will carry with you your entire career? This vote will be carried with you for So if you're a fiscal conservative, throw that entire career. rating out the window. If you say that you're against taxes and you're for less government, throw that out the window. Under normal negotiations, at the end of Session, many of you would spared to vote on the final package, and you could go back home and say, "I was a fiscal conservative. I didn't vote to raise I voted to cut government." But these are abnormal taxes. negotiations, and now you're being forced to walk the plank, where if it was a normal negotiation process, you would have And you know who you all are. You're called targets. You're called individuals that are in targeted or swing areas. But under this plan, you're being told in your caucuses, "Walk the because a certain Leader wants to be like Mike. I want to be like Mike. That's what this is all about. But -- but look, it's great to be like Mike. We all want to be like Mike. to be like Mike. But when Mike -- but when Mike was slam-dunking

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

packages over here the last ten years, he had a Democratic his Senate to slam-dunk them into. You're slam-dunking them into a Democratic House. And do you think for a moment, when this thing rolls out of here, that the Democratic sponsor of your tax bill which will be the next bill - do you think they're going to concur with your tax bill? And do you think the Republican sponsor of this bill is going to call the bill? Lee Daniels is going to tell House Republicans "Look, let's not set up our Madigan's going to kill it. Don't call the bill." what you're doing. This is an act in futility. You're going to be voting on something that you're going to carry the rest of your And you are poised to vote on the largest tax package in Illinois history. And you'll say, "Oh, no we're not." Well, let's read some of the numbers, right now. Extension of the surcharge: four hundred and ninety-one million dollars, according to the Bureau of the Budget. Medicaid provider tax: three hundred and twenty-seven million. The cigarette and tobacco loophole: hundred and eighty-five million. That is one billion point zero three million. One billion dollars, and that's not adding the thirty million that you all voted for for George Ryan and Okav? That's the tax package that license fees. sponsoring and you'll all be punching green on. And your spending cuts total a hundred and sixty-two million dollars. My arithmetic shows that's a ten-to-one ratio of taxes over spending cuts. Ten-to-one taxes over spending cuts are what some of you conservatives are going to be punching green on, because your Leader wants to be like Mike. Now, let's take a look at maybe some of you said, in your primary elections and in your general elections. The Gentlemen from Inverness -- Senator Inverness, he said - this is in his primary election, "Unlike my opponent, Margaret M. Basch, I oppose tax increases." Well, think Margaret's going to be back some day to talk to you about

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

that. And how about Tim Landis, who wrote in the DeKalb paper the Senator from DeKalb - he said that the Legislature should look at ways of cutting waste, before committing to a specific tax increase. And then how about the Senator from Aurora, who this March, when he announced his truth in budgeting package, said, "We'll spend less; we'll mandate less; and we'll tax Throw that out the window. And how about the Senator from Elmhurst, April 8th, 1992: "I'm very concerned about some of revenue aspects of the budget. Even though they're so-called 'sin I do not support them." What are you they're taxes. going to tell your people, Senator? And how about the Senator from Rockford, in his editorial, where they supported him? This is his endorsement: "He's a businessman. He wants to cut taxes. He wants to cut and control government." Great editorial. also said, he said -- but one thing he said he won't do is One billion-plus, Senator. So, I think we see a big, big tax increase coming down the line here. And I want to thank the Democratic Party, for this great, great vote. behalf of we've waited all Session, because you've had here, where you protected everybody; controlled process you protected your targets; you protected your swing targets, et cetera. But now you're all out there, all on your own. "Well, don't use the don't care what you say; you may say, surcharge, that's not a tax increase. Well, don't use the hospital assessment, that's -- we're just extending that." In '94 '96, we're using the figure you one thing: and in one-billion-dollar tax increase. And why? Because one person wants to be like Mike. Just one person. And by the time you get into your cars tonight on the Senate drive, and you put that key in the ignition, this package is going to be dead in the Illinois House.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Mike. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I was very interested in hearing the comments of my colleague on the other side, but, Senator LaPaille, you're no Mike Madigan. And sure that my Leader has no interest in being Mike Madigan. I'm sure Mike Madigan's happy to be himself. You sit pontificate, and you pull out all these things. Have vou forgotten all the taxes you stuck us with, from your party? Have you forgotten all the mandates you passed in your party? Oh, don't remember that, do we? But I have a long memory. I've been here almost twenty-one years, and let me tell you, have been in a financial mess if we hadn't passed so many darned mandates. And you know it, and I know it. And when you say that we're being irresponsible, I say you're irresponsible, because you know there's a need. There's a need for education. There's a need to take care of that granny tax, instead of taxing the people unfairly for it. And there's a need to help people's health too. And why? We've taken a sin tax. It's not really called a sin tax, But still - tobacco - we are putting a tax on all tobacco products. What's wrong with that? For heaven's sakes, you want to raise income tax on people? I think you would. I -- as a matter of fact, I'm beginning to think you haven't met a tax that you didn't pass. Well, I think these are responsible things. And I do say that we have to be responsible people to the people of Illinois. And if you can't explain it back home, I can. And I'm willing to take the heat, because we have to stand up and do right thing, the responsible thing for education, the responsible thing for our senior citizens, and the responsible thing for State of Illinois.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Senator Collins, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR COLLINS:

For the purpose of discussing the issue before us.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your case.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

He answers he'll yield.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator -- Senator Maitland, this morning, which was the first time that any of us had an opportunity to see what was in this amendment, and the hearing that was conducted, was the members of the Governor's staff present at that meeting to have any input or answer any questions?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, I don't recall that there were -- that there were any members from the Governor's staff in the meeting this morning.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Were there any department liaisons who are usually available in committees to answer any questions, in reference to what -- how this budget -- this amendment impacts upon their agency?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, I didn't -- I didn't personally invite anyone to the -- to the -- to the meeting. However, there was a notice that was given on the meeting, and certainly anyone who wanted to be there,

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

I would suspect, had -- had a chance to be there. I can recall a number of other Appropriation meetings this spring where there were no Governor's agencies' people there, including the time when the Senate Democrats offered the amendment to take five hundred million dollars out of the budget. No, I don't recall anyone being there.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, did any of the Members on the committee from this side of the aisle request any information or responses from any of the code departments of the Governor's Office?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, my -- my recollection is, one Member of -- of the Democratic side of the aisle did seek some information. I'd -- he asked me if he had permission, and I said he did, to -- to leave the caucus, or leave the meeting and go out and call whoever he wanted to call. I -- I had no problem with that at all. We -- we do that frequently, and I assume that -- that you folks can do it as well.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, Senator Maitland, it is my understanding that our staff did do just that and was told that the Governor had instructed these people not to come to this particular meeting. Now, you indicated that there had been times before that staff members from the various departments and the Governor's Office did not appear at certain hearings, but this is not a ordinary hearing. We're talking about the budget. We're talking about, really, the budget

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

for this State for the next fiscal year. And -- and you can't tell me that the Governor does not have any interest in this issue. This is his primary responsibility. Nor can you tell me that those liaison people that we are paying a salary - and this their primary job to -- to work with the various committees in reference to issues impacting upon their agencies - that would not have appeared at that meeting this morning. It was not intended for them to be there. It -- this whole thing is a farce. That -- that's all it is. At least the Governor had sense not to give it any legitimacy. And I salute him for that, by not I concur with Gary LaPaille. having his people down there. for you, Senator Maitland, you indicated that this bill -this amendment was beneficial to both side of the aisle. I concur with For you it shows us this test of your leadership, and your vou. true colors. You can't hide behind the -- the Democrats being the big spenders, and -- and we're raising all the taxes while trying to maintain some kind of restraints, and -- and -- and -and fiscal accountability and credibility to the State. You can't hide behind that anymore. For us, you know, you just make it very simple and easy for us to show the people out there that there is, If the people of the State of Illinois in fact, a clear choice. had any doubts in their mind as to the kind of leadership and the kinds of things that we did under a Democratic Leader versus what we have now, and the kinds of things that you're doing today, then we don't have to worry about it no more. So thank you very much. I'm glad to see that your true colors have come out.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Berman, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR BERMAN:

To debate the issue, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Debate the issue.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

### SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I wanted to address, for a moment or two, an issue that all of us campaign on, and that's the issue of education. And let me tell you what this proposal does to education, and you noticed I used the word "to" rather than "for". The putting together of any budget involves a setting of priorities. a certain amount of money, and we determine how we're going to spend it. Let me tell you what the priorities are in this bill. They are not education. If you look at the percentage increase of elementary and secondary education and higher education compared every other area of State spending, here is what you find: This budget increases education spending by 4.2 percent; increases all other State spending by 8.6 percent. Is that putting education as your priority? I suggest, it does not. To those of us from Chicago, the President has distributed a sheet with a explanation of the funding of -- for Chicago schools, and I quote, "As everyone knows, Chicago will lose money next year as a result of several factors", unquote. The problem is that the President doesn't explain what those factors are. One factor is a terrible history of underfunding of education, which this bill continues. Number two, it continues, without addressing at all in any substantive way, the question of the shell game - of taking lottery, from riverboat gambling, from money from the And as of this year, we owe those accounts a hundred surcharge. and eighty million dollars, and even with this budget, we're still forty million dollars short of taking the money out of designated funds and spending it elsewhere in State Government. This budget underfunds Chicago by seven hundred -- I'm sorry, underfunds Chicago by seventy-six million dollars, Fiscal '93 compared to Fiscal '94. Seventy-six million dollars less. that the way we address the needs of four hundred and ten thousand children? Now those of us from suburban areas, let me invite you

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

printout that's to take a look, if you have the same distributed. Let me give you some example. I represent some suburban schools - schools that are intended to be helped by this And let me tell you what the intention of the -- of the turnaround of this budget is. Traditionally, we have spent twice much money for general State aid as we'd spend for the categorical programs. We spend approximately two billion dollars for general State aid and one billion dollars a year for the categoricals. Two to one. This proposal reverses twice as much money on categorical money -- on categorical grants, as compared to general State aid. What does that do? those of you from downstate districts, outside the suburbs, it From those of you from Chicago, it hurts you. And hurts you. from those from the suburbs, it may not help you, because all categoricals are subject to grant requests, to applications, and your school district may not get the money that this printout it will get. Now, let me give you some examples, and I don't think that my districts are much different than any other suburban districts: Senate -- Skokie District 68, very high level, a lighthouse district -- elementary district. You know how much more money is going to get to them with this manipulation? Thirty-six thousand dollars; Skokie District 69, an increase of sixty-seven thousand dollars; Niles Elementary District, increase of fifteen thousand dollars: Skokie/Fairview District, thirty-five-thousand-dollars Prairie, increase: East twenty-one-thousand-dollar increase; Evanston Township High School a multi-million-dollar institution that produces the mathematic students in the entire State, the Math and Science Academy notwithstanding. You know how much more money education-oriented program gives to Evanston Township Seventy-three thousand dollars, Ladies High School? Gentlemen. So those of you from the suburbs, take a look. You're

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

not giving education the priority that you talk about. You're not giving them the order of preference to help the poor districts, and even to your suburban taxpayers with more money supposedly going in the suburbs, there isn't a inch -- there isn't one word in here about property tax relief in exchange for those outrageous property taxes that your suburban voters are paying for. None of this makes any sense from the point of view of education.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Palmer, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To speak to the issue on the Floor. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Continue.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Maitland, a question.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you. In the piece put out yesterday for the press, and in the discussions today, it has been said that higher education has increased. I'd like to ask you if my analysis is correct. Under Article 39, Illinois Student Assistance Commission, are my figures correct that the Minority Teacher Scholarship Program has been reduced by seven hundred thousand dollars? And is it correct, under Article 36, Board of Higher Education, that the Minority Recruitment Retention and Education Achievement Grants have been reduced by a hundred and fifty thousand?

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, both are true, and we have -- we have debated this issue before. This is all action we have taken previously in this

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Chamber.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Palmer.

### SENATOR PALMER:

So that -- as my colleague who has spoken eloquently about education, but focused specifically on elementary, it has -- it seems to me that when we talk about an increase in higher education, such increase has been selectively chosen, that those people who are women, who are minorities, and frankly I'm getting weary of using that word, because it seems to give the excuse for removing people of color from the mix when we talk about increasing higher education. Now I have just selected those two but in addition there are other cuts. 93.3 thousand dollars from personal service lines for Illinois Student Assistance Commission. We could go on. But I suggest that when all of take a look at this -- and it's become very popular to talk about how to reduce the State budget. That's fine, but when it is done on the backs, especially of those who are the next generation, and particularly those of color who have had a difficult time as it is, then I think that we have taken the wrong direction, and as my colleague said, the priorities are off.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have been listening to the rhetoric from the other side, and I am a little bit confused. Senator LaPaille opens up and says this is a big tax increase. He doesn't like the budget, but he hasn't offered anything on his own. Senator Berman comes back and says, you know there isn't enough money for education. Even though, Senator LaPaille says got the biggest tax increase in the history of the State. Senator Palmer also talks about some inadequacies in the budget. But you

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

know what? In all of these, there's no bills. Where is the beef? The beef is coming out of your mouth. You know, when I was in the steel business I used to call on a company and never got an order. And the reason I didn't get the order is the guy told me my price was too high every time, and one day he called in and gave me an order. And I said - by George, I couldn't resist - I said, "What do we do now?" He said, "Well, you know, your price was high, but Jorgensen Steel didn't have the material." I said, "Well, hell, if I didn't have the material, I'd give it to you for nothing." Okay. Now, I'm going to tell you that if I had my choice, I would be for more money for education. I would be against the extension of the surcharge. I would be for all those things if I could do one thing, and not have to explain where the money came from. that's precisely what you're doing on the other side. You know what, where's the bill? Where's the bill? Where's the bill? want to do all these things? Where's the bill? When I went the University of Chicago we had a Chancellor who said, "The University of Chicago is not a very good school, but it's the best one there is." You know what? This is not a very good bill, it's a hell of a lot better than anything you guys are proposing. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Severns, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. To express concern.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Severns.

# SENATOR SEVERNS:

I was just actually looking up, Senator DeAngelis, the -- the number of my bill. It's been so long ago that you buried it in a subcommittee. I was going to say, we had a bill. But the reason I really rise is because I am concerned. When I spoke with both my friend and respected colleague, Chairman Maitland, last night

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

about the budget and what time we might expect the budget, knowing that our staff would be working all night trying to analyze it, he said, "I think you might like it." And I stood there and thought, "I hope I do". Because I know all of us want to resolve the budget issues facing the State, and I know that all of us want to go home by June 30th. One element of the budget that was last night - at least by way of your press release - talked about a deficit budget reduction package, and I certainly one who has been working diligently on that issue for several years and especially the last three years, that we would Except that when I look at the eight reduction package. hundred pages proposed in this budget, I don't see it. But release said that we'll reduce the budget by nineteen to Today's hearing reiterated that we seventy-six million. know how and we don't know where. If I look at the Comptroller's report released today, Comptroller Netsch reminds us that we have hundred and eight million dollars currently in her office as backlog - unpaid bills. Now, that doesn't account for over half-billion dollars' worth of bills that have not yet even been submitted. So we have over a billion dollars' worth of old bills, and if -- if your press release is correct, that we reduce nineteen to seventy-six million, I will give you credit that that is a step forward, but it certainly is not enough. This budget does not address, in any meaningful way, how we are going to resolve the outstanding debts of this State. Before the Revenue Committee this year, and before this General Assembly last year, we tried to pass a bill that said we, as a State, should do what promised we would do when we passed, for one year only, the denial of prompt payment obligations to the medical providers of State. And yet, for the third year now, we're going to deny those same medical providers that common courtesy. And yet, will expect them to go out and borrow to pay for our unpaid bills.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

What we do do in this budget, and what your proposed budget will ask the citizens of this State, is to dig deeper into their pockets to pay for this budget, to the tune of over one billion dollars. So you're going to ask with this budget, predicated on the passage of 282, the taxpayers of this State to pay out over a billion dollars more of their hard-earned tax dollars with the hope, prayer and promise that perhaps nineteen to seventy-six million dollars will be provided in budget deficit reduction. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out, or even an expert at the Math and Science Academy, that that's not dood Further, your budget balances -- or puts forward what is proposed to be a balanced budget - far from balanced in any person's view, opinion - by reneging on a commitment that we in this General Assembly made, signed by Governor Edgar. For doubts whether or not we owe the cities and communities across this State that we have been so honored to represent, million dollars in FY'94, I would suggest that you go to Chapter 30, Section 115/1.a <sic>, and in Statute, we will all be reminded that in this current -- in this current budget being addressed, we should commit ourselves, as we are statutorily obligated, to forty million dollars, and yet this budget doesn't do it. So we've We put forward a budget that attempts to resolve deficit issues and budget challenges by asking the cities and local communities to go deeper into debt. Someday, Mr. President, we're going to have to pay the piper, and I regret that this budget doesn't do it.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Stern, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR STERN:

To address the amendment, Mr. President.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Address the amendment.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

## SENATOR STERN:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, in my district office we have a little joke about how I am the suburban caucus on the Democratic side. I know Senator Dunn takes some exception to that. I like to say that as I vote the suburban caucus votes I was looking forward to seeing this budget. I was hoping that with the new - as I had understood it was going to be suburban interests at the forefront, there would be things in it that I could support enthusiastically. I was somewhat excited about the increase in categoricals. I noticed, however, and Senator Berman corroborated, that it's rather a piddling increase when you examine the whole. I was pleased about the increases in higher education. I note, however, as my colleague, Senator Palmer, points out, that that is for white male instructors and professors. I have -- I noted today, on my first visit to the Appropriations Committee - I -- I take shorthand, so forgive me for the exact quote - that Senator Maitland made the statement, "We chose to prioritize, and that's a proper approach." That is a proper approach. But I have been concerned for some about who was going to do the prioritizing for this Body and for this General Assembly. For years I have watched five men - I could have said five white men; that is no longer true - five men make the decisions that a hundred and seventy-seven of us were elected to make. We have had practically no input. This budget represents the decisions of one man. There's no negotiation evident on any of these. Now, as to the priorities, they are not mine, Senator Maitland. The Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Children and Family Services, are cut below what the Governor suggested. Not below last year's, I grant. These are our most fragile citizens. are two very important areas where we are not placing an appropriate emphasis, according to my priorities. The Department

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

of Corrections, where we are going to build a maximum security prison - terrific; we must do it, because we've enhanced penalties to such an extent that all the other prisons are overflowing. We're letting them in the front door and out the back. But we are not adding money to electronic detention or to boot camps, both recommended strongly by the Governor's Task Force on Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse is Corrections. The taking severe cuts in the treatment process. This is an area that has substantial ramifications to health care and to corrections. are things which down the line are going to snowball and Yes, Senator Maitland, you have chosen to make haunt us. priorities, and there's nothing wrong with that, but these are not my priorities, and I had so hoped that they would be.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator McCracken, for what purpose do you arise?

### SENATOR McCRACKEN:

Parliamentary inquiry.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your point.

# SENATOR McCRACKEN:

Mr. President, is it true you want to be like Michael Jordan? PRESIDENT PHILIP:

I'd sure like to make the money that he makes, and have all the talent that he has.

### SENATOR McCRACKEN:

Well, I want to compliment the Democratic Chairman on his wit. Senator LaPaille, I have a question for you. When you vote for the extension of the surcharge in an end-of-Session compromise, are you going to put out a radio ad about yourself putting out taxes of a billion dollars? You know, we didn't bother looking at what you may have said in your race for Senate, 'cause frankly we didn't care. But I wouldn't be surprised if you maybe said you

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

were for the taxes, or that maybe many of you over there said you were for the extension of the surcharge. And if your remarks are any indication, you're not going to vote for it today, but there will be many of you who vote for it ultimately, if it comes down to a compromise. And everything you like to say about us today, you're going to have to go and put on -- in radio ads for yourselves. The fact of the matter is this: Mike Madigan is not against the extension of the surcharge. What he's against is the allocation of the money. He -- he is not opposed to this budget it raises too much in taxes; he's opposed because it because doesn't include any Chicago taxes, because there isn't more money in this budget. And frankly, this can only get worse, rather than better. Now, I heard Mike one time say, when he got sixty of his Members to vote for a tax proposal, that "Maybe this isn't the bill that'll be the final product, but this'll set the parameters of the debate." We are setting the parameters of the debate today, and anyone who doesn't think that's the case, hasn't been around here long enough. And when push comes to shove, going to be an allocation; we're going to make those hard decisions. And a lot of Democrats are going to be voting for all this in one way or another. So if you want to put your radio ads out, that's fine. All I ask is that you give yourselves equal time.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Welch, for what purpose do you arise?

#### SENATOR WELCH:

I'd like to speak to House Bill 5.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Be my guest.

### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. I want to thank Senator McCracken for his revelation on future political ads. I can assure you that the

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Senate Republicans will run whatever ads they want based on votes from day to day, and the ads will reflect how you vote and how they want you to be reflected as having voted. If we do -somebody does vote for this in the future, that'll be ignored. The vote that'll be recorded will be the one that you vote No. it's -- it's a strange process, unlike the House, I'm afraid. But DeAngelis raised an important question. He said, "Where are your bills?" It's kind of like the question, "What trees Well, let me refer you to a couple bills, Senator introduced Senate Bill 983, that was on DeAngelis. Ι It didn't get anywhere. You wouldn't -- you wouldn't Calendar. basically provided for real estate tax relief. Τt raised the income tax; it provided that money right back for real estate tax relief. You folks wouldn't pass that. Look at Senate Joint Resolution 31, that provided for more money by putting a graduated income tax on individuals making over eighty thousand dollars. You wouldn't pass that one. You know, the question, "What trees do you plant?" - we planted a lot of trees over here trying to help -- trying to fund education. You folks won't let That's the problem with it. We look at sun shine on 'em. what you're doing with the budget. You know, this year we have over 1.1 billion dollars in new revenue. If you take the quarter percent surcharge of four hundred and ninety-one million dollars, natural revenue growth of four hundred and twenty-nine million dollars, and the twenty-five-cent-a-pack cigarette tax of hundred and eighty-five million dollars, that's 1.1 billion dollars. Out of that, one hundred and forty-five million dollars allocated for elementary and secondary education. Education Governor, as he has proclaimed himself. fourteen percent of new revenue to the State goes to education how does that make anyone an Education Governor? That's not a That is a very, very minor priority. You know, we've

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

-- we've heard the Governor say that "We've got a fight this year between kids and concrete." Well, with this budget, I think we can safely say, concrete has won.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR DEMUZIO:

To speak on this amendment, if I might.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Go right ahead.

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, Mr. -- Mr. President, I don't believe that you want like Michael Jordan. The only leader in this General Assembly that wants to be like Michael Jordan is the guy on my left, he's too fat and short. But he -- but he jumps around pretty good. I -- I wanted to -- and I -- I don't want to be redundant of what has already been said, but I -- I do want to speak to Senator Maitland, the point that I made in committee today, that is basically about the deficit reduction, and in fact, paying I think that is probably one of the most our old bills. unconscionable things that I think that we haven't addressed this -- in this budget. The fact that someone already has alluded to the -- the Comptroller's report, and it is -- it's not very -it's not very good to have four hundred and ten million dollars' worth of backlogged bills, and we've had that for a couple of years, and you said yourself we're going to have about hundred and thirty-five million dollars perhaps by June the 30th, and I suspect 1.4 billion, I guess, in total lapse-period spending of using next year's money to pay this year's bills. figured that this was in -- we were in for the long haul and it was going to take us a couple of years to -- you know, to climb out and pay our old bills and get back to some stability and -and back to some confidence that the vendors and the providers

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

that were out there that were doing service on behalf of the State of Illinois would be paid in a timely manner. And we've already gone through the process now where the -- the druggists and some of the other folks who got caught in this process early on who are no longer in business because they couldn't afford to wait for the reimbursement of the State of Illinois. But I want to point out that in this budget we talk about pork barrel projects, think the point has already been made that we're talking about maybe one billion or 1.4 billion dollars of new -- new and the fact that this budget has only addressed itself to paying about nineteen million dollars of the deficit reduction. reduction, I quess we both can agree on, is about nine hundred and thirty-five million dollars in total, which -- which I think you've indicated in the -- in the committee. You shorted group insurance by thirty-eight million bucks. That means there's -aoina to be nineteen million dollars in deficit You've added -- you're not going to -- you're not reduction. going to approve the deficit reduction by nineteen million, you're going to compound it by another thirty-eight million dollars, because of the cut of the group insurance program. So I think it's really unconscionable of -- of all of us right now to allow this to really continue to happen. I don't know if this budget's going to make it all the way through the General Assembly. Senator McCracken has indicated, perhaps it'll be back. But I do believe that one of the things that we ought to be talking about a -- a -- perhaps a different mechanism, more allocation to clear out that deficit reduction, make ourselves look -- make ourselves look respectable again in the eyes of the voters and those people who do business with the State of Illinois. mind pork barrel projects. You know, when -- I see we're supposed to be taking fifteen million dollars and transferring out of the Road Fund. Boy, when we did that, we were all being charged with

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

projects are going to be delayed in our districts and what have you. There are a number of things in this budget that -- that I don't like, and I think that if we do get to the position of -- of a compromise, and we do get into a position where we are at least afforded the opportunity to have some input into the budgeting process, I do believe that paying our old bills ought to be one of I think we owe it to the taxpayers of the first priorities. Illinois, the people who do business with the State. We owe it to ourselves. It's not going to be a two-year program. It seems to that under this basis, we're never going to climb out of this morass; we're just going to contribute to it. You can't taking in that kind of new revenue, new money, and keep spending it, and say that we're going to only give tacit approval, tacit -less priority to paying the bills. I think that has to be the priority, and I hope that before we do adjourn on June the 30th that at least our viewpoint, with respect to that, is afforded the opportunity by the majority in this Chamber to -- to look at what we've said today, and perhaps to fashion something that we can all live with. This is something today we cannot all live with. Thank you.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you arise? SENATOR FAWELL:

Just for a couple of brief comments on the bill, sir. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

State your comments.

# SENATOR FAWELL:

You know this argument about the bills reminds me of a friend of mine who loved to go shopping. She shopped and shopped and shopped and put everything on -- on credit cards, and then when the bills came, she told her husband, "It isn't my fault. The problem is, you guys don't make enough money." I've sat on the

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Appropriation Committee now for eight years. Seven of those eight years, it isn't this side of the aisle that's been in charge of the budget. It's your side. It's the Democrat side, in both the House and the Senate. Every year your Chairman stood up and said, "We have done our constitutional work, and the budget balanced." And then we'd get halfway through the year, then we found out the budget wasn't balanced. We forgot a million here or a million there, and you know, as old Dirksen said, sometimes add up a few million, talking about real money. This budget didn't get out of balance just in the last three or four months when the Republicans have been in charge of the Senate. You guys did it. And we're trying to get you out of it. We're trying to figure out a way to pay the bills that you ran up. And it seems to me this is at least a start. This is our attempt to at least get the discussion going. If you don't want the surtax, I'm sure there's a lot of -- of -- of us over here who would be perfectly willing to take the surtax, as long as Chicago understands who gets the majority of that surtax, that they're not going to get any of that There's other things we could negotiate on. You want to talk about pork? I'm sure if we added it all up, County of Cook and the City of Chicago gets far more than their share. It's time that we stop this discussion. It's time that we sat down and did the people's work, and it's time that we came up with a budget that we can agree upon, and this is a good start. And we all ought to be voting for it.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Tom Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR T. DUNN:

To discuss the bill here.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Make your point.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you. Senator Fawell, you promised not to talk about my I'm sorry to see you broke that promise, talking about charging things. I would like to express my disappointment in this solution that's been presented today, without being personal. You know, we had a large turnover last November in this Body; probably one of the largest turnovers we've ever had - certainly the largest in my short tenure. We had a lot of new faces, and we had a lot of new energy. And to someone who's been here a number of years, it's always good to see new energy, but this is not change - what's being presented - and it's really not a solution. This is still a billion-dollar increase any way you want to slice And I want to ask the question, rhetorically, today: Where is that energy today that speaks to accountability in education? Where is that money that we all know needs to flow to the teachers in the classroom, that will cause the ACT scores to rise so that we can be competitive, truly, in the world markets? Where is that energy that addresses the question that's often asked to us on campaigns about property taxes, by seniors and by young people? There is no echo in this Chamber today representing those people in the form of this bill. Shame on us for not addressing property taxes when we have this opportunity. This is the number one cry we all hear in our areas when we campaign, and here is another opportunity for solution to those people that are suffering from high taxes. Maybe like the Cubs: "Maybe next year."

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Believe it or not, we're down to the last speaker. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I will not belabor many of the points that have already been brought up relate to this amendment. But I'd like to comment on some remarks made by the sponsor, and that is, he indicated that if we not vote for this, there's a great possibility that we would not get out by June 30th. The problem is, Senator, if you vote this, you will further a deadlock and cause us -- the possibility of us going beyond June the 30th. We have meeting on the issue - the Leaders, the Governor - and it came of great concern to me yesterday, as you moved through the various in the rules to get to this -- this particular piece of changes business, that someone was not acting in good faith. thought that in those meetings we would try to come together and agree on a process, agree on a budget, agree on the necessary to fund that budget. And we met again today on that same issue. And I think the other two Leaders agree, as I agree, this piece of legislation is not going to be what the final product is. And I asked the Senate -- Senate President, why should you proceed, when you know very well this is not going to be the product?" So evidently during your Caucus, I assume, he nailed each one of you to the cross to vote for something that's not going to be the final product. But the issue at hand as we talk about all the funding priorities - concrete versus kids - the increase in funding for education, as Senator Berman clearly pointed out to each of you - that as we increase the budget by over 8.6 percent, only a mere 4.5 percent -- or two percent into education. That's where our priorities are mixed up in this amendment. We hope to get out of here on June 30th if we could have sincere negotiations, sincere people sitting down trying to

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

resolve a problem. I was shocked that no one from the coded departments or agencies came in to testify on the budget, in light of -- in light of what the Governor issued in his press release that he indicated this is his program. I'm very shocked. If we are going to get out of here on June 30th, Senator Maitland, it must be a true spirt to resolve the problem. I really hate the use of the words "Be like Mike" in this negotiation, because Mike is genuine; he is sincere, and the that we saw at the stadium, Senator Philip, together. what I'm saying to you is that in the spirit of sincerity spirit of trying to solve the needs of the people of this State, it cannot be done by one person, and it will not be done by one person. I urge the Members on this side of the aisle to do what they should do; do what is in the best interests of the people of this State; do what is the best interests of the Members of the General Assembly, and vote this amendment down and vote this bill down. And -- and when we get together during the first of the week, hopefully we can have some sincere negotiations and we will get through on June 30th, and not give us a picture like we just recently had: another "three-peat" on a amendment know that's going to fail. This is not May 28th. I want to get out of here. Each of you want to get out of here, process, Senator Maitland, further delays, because this is a one-person process that is doomed to fail.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Any further discussion? If not, on Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5, all those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Whoop. Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Let me -- let me briefly, Mr. President, make a few comments. There has been much said, much of which, I'm sorry to say, frankly, is

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

not true. And let me -- let me first of all address my friends on the other side of the aisle. It is clear to everyone in this the confusion and lack of organization as it pertains to Chamber. the State budget from that side of the aisle. Some are for a substantial increase in funding; others are calling for substantial decreases in taxes. That's bad. But you know what's Some of you are calling for both, as has happened really worse? for so many years from that side of the aisle, and it One of the difficulties of being in the Majority and we found this out - is you have to be responsible. elected to do a job, and we are elected to make some tough decisions. And we plan to do that - today. You don't plan to do it today, but you're going to have to do it some time this summer. Guarantee it. That's a given. Senator McCracken made that point. Senator LaPaille, the father of the surcharge, I'm not surprised at your political comments, but I want to tell you something: I concerned about the hospitals in the City of Chicago. I am, frankly, more concerned about the hospitals in the City of Chicago than I am the ones in downstate, because you've got some very serious problems, and we addressed those problems and you know it. your vote is going to be against those hospitals - absolutely - and more importantly, against the people that those hospitals Senator Berman, you and I have stood shoulder-to-shoulder serve. on educational issues for my fifteen years here, and I'm sure you were a strong leader before I got here. And you are committed to I am upset; I am appalled that you found fault with a attempt to increase the funding for elementary and diligent secondary education. And, yes, we put a preponderance of increase in the categoricals, and that helps the City and, indeed, helps downstate as well. Senator Carroll, one of the great, great speakers on the Floor of this Chamber for, lo, these years, and you can make things sound very good, and you can make

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

things sound very bad, and you did that in your remarks. me comment on one point you made: the automatic increase in taxes - property taxes - in this State as a result of the action we shall take today. Every responsible legislator in this Chamber and across the Rotunda made the point when we passed the surcharge and sent that money - sent that money - to the municipalities and the counties: Please don't build that money into your base; for those one-time concerns that you've had and simply haven't been able to afford. Many across this State did, and they're not screaming at us. As a matter of fact, they're saying, "Right on. You're doing the right thing." In some cases, that's not But it's not -- it's not a blanket across the State. Senator Palmer, the aid to minority students: in excess of eight million dollars. Listen to this: Eight million dollars in this State goes directly to minority students. And we're -- we're concerned a hundred-thousand-dollar reduction? Senator frankly could not believe your statement that the increases to higher ed go to white males. When was the last time you were on a campus in this State? I have been on a lot of those campuses, and there are white males teaching, absolutely, and there are white females teaching, and there are minorities teaching. And heaven only knows, that was a statement on the Floor of this Senate ought not have been made. We increased the funding for higher education in this State this year because we are concerned about all of our best and brightest academicians leaving this State and going to the private sector or to other universities. want to lose those people, because we need them to keep Illinois on the cutting edge of technology, and we plan to do that with or Senator Severns, I, too, am concerned about your help. the statements that -- that you made. We, too, shoulder-to-shoulder, concerned of downstate issues. believe the budget that we are offering to you today, and ask for

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

your help, will address the concerns of our part of the State and, indeed, the entire State. Any bill that you vote on from this point on will be a more difficult vote for you to take. There will be none any better. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have an awesome responsibility here. We believe this amendment offers that responsibility.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All right. The question is, should Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5 pass. Roll -- you want a roll call? You're certainly entitled to a roll call. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have you all voted who wish? Have you all voted who wish? Have you all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, no voting Present. Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5 is adopted. Any further Floor amendments have been approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

3rd Reading. ...(microphone cutoff)...Bill 5, on the Order of 3rd Reading. Excuse me. House Bill 5, on the Order of 3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 5.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Maitland.

## SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I -- I -- I'm not going to give the same speech. I think -- I think the point has been made, and I would ask the Body for -- for support of House Bill 5.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Any further discussion? If not... Oh. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

## SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. I don't think this bill has changed in the -- in the -- in the past two minutes, so I ask the Members on this side of the aisle to vote No.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Jones. All right. On House Bill 5, Senator Maitland, to close. He's already closed. The question is, shall House Bill 5 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have you all voted who wish? Have you all voted who wish? Take the record. 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, no voting Present. House Bill 5, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Now, at the top of page 4, House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 282. Senator Watson. Senator Watson, do you -- do you wish the bill to return to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment?

## SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I do.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 282 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Any objections? If not, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 282. Mr. Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Watson and others.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson.

# SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 1 becomes, now, the bill. Everything else is struck. And it has

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

eleven provisions, and I would like to briefly mention what those It extends the hospital assessment program from provisions are. July 1st, 1993, through June 30th of 1995, and establishes a rate of the hospital's gross patient revenues, less the Medicare contractual allowances. This is a reduction current tax on hospitals. Ιt imposes а one-dollar-per-day you probably licensing fees on all nursing home beds. As aware, we had the one-dollar-per-day fee for the grant program. This maintains that fee, and that fee cannot be passed on -- the patient. It also eliminates the six-dollar-and-thirty-cent know it. It changes the definition of granny tax, as we now "neglect" under the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act and the Juvenile Court Act, and provides that when -- a child shall not be considered neglected for the sole reason that the child's parents or other guardian has left the child in the care of an adult relative. What has happened in many cases is a -- in an a -- a situation in which a child will be left with a grandmother, a and that then will become the foster parent and receive foster care at three hundred and forty-four dollars per month. think that's wrong. Wе think that's a family responsibility. They will still receive support through AFDC of around a hundred and two million dollars per month -- a hundred and two dollars a This allows for the Anna Veterans' Home to be operated month. through a contract with a private contractor. This eliminates the General Revenue funding for county hospitals. This makes the surcharge permanent at the rate of three percent for individuals and 4.8 for corporate. It changes the Income Tax Surcharge formula for -- Fiscal Year 1994 only, and that formula will reflect an eighty-twenty split: twenty going to locals, raising, roughly, sixty-nine million dollars for units of local government. It eliminates the forty-million-dollar replacement. begins in Fiscal year 1995 -- increases the Local Government

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Distribution Fund's share from one-twelfth to one-eleventh, that -- under current proposal and projected figures will -- will roughly raise around sixty-five million dollars, all of which will go to local units of government, as it does now - counties and municipalities. It increases the cigarette tax by twenty-five We now have a thirty-cent tax in Illinois. Ιt cents per pack. raise it to fifty-five cents. That will generate roughly a hundred and seventy-five million dollars which, of course, will go to help relieve the pressure of the granny tax and allow us to eliminate the granny tax, as we now know it. It creates a Tobacco Products Tax; that's the smokeless tobacco, cigars, some feel that were left out of the original tobacco tax. We have no tax on that currently. This establishes a twenty percent tax on the distributor's wholesale price, and that generates around Mr. President, I'll be glad to answer any million dollars. questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Demuzio. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to question the germaneness of this amendment to this bill, and I will -- on the following grounds, and afford you the opportunity to speak with Parliamentarian. Ι would object to the Senate's your consideration of House Bill 282 as amended by Amendment No. 1 on the following grounds: Article IV, Section 8(d) of the Illinois Constitution expressly provides that "Bills, except bills for appropriations" and other -- "and for the codification, revision or rearrangement of laws, shall be confined to one subject." the Supreme Court of Illinois has held in Clarke versus Storchak, 384 Ill. 564, this rule is violated if legislation contains subjects that have no relation to each other and a violation of this rule renders the legislation void. Specifically, Senate Rule

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

7-13 embodies the single-subject rule and its purposes by prohibiting amendments to bills that are not germane to those bills. The rule specifically states that: "No motion or other legislative measure on a subject different from that under "color consideration shall be admitted under" the amendment." Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 282 does a different things: it creates a Tobacco Products Tax; it amends the State Revenue Sharing Act; it amends the Income Tax amends the Public Aid Code; amends the Medicaid Revenue Act; amends the Abused and Neglected Child Report Act; amends the Home Act; and amends the Juvenile Court Act. There is Veterans' absolutely no question that House Bill 282, as amended Amendment No. 1, violates the single-subject rule of the Illinois Constitution, nor in -- in the judgment of our attorneys, is the amendment germane to the bill, since the bill itself deals with lung transplants for Public Aid recipients. Therefore, I object, and I would ask for a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not this amendment is, in fact, germane and -- or does it, in fact, violate both the State Constitution as well as Senate Rule 7-13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Demuzio, the Chair had anticipated your -- your -- your concern. The Chair rules that the amendment is, in fact, germane. Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

#### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I would then appeal the ruling of the Chair, because I think that this is, in fact, a legitimate question. I believe it is one that ought to be considered by the -- by the Senate, and I do, in fact, think that a roll call with respect to the challenging the ruling of the Chair in this respect is in order. And I would ask that it be done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

That request is in order, Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

has appealed the ruling of the Chair. The question is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. All those in favor of sustaining the ruling, vote Aye. All those opposed to sustaining the ruling, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays. And the motion, having failed to receive the necessary three-fifths negative votes, the appeal fails, and the ruling of the Chair is sustained. Senator Demuzio.

#### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President. I also then would challenge the ruling of the Chair with respect to Senate Rule 7-13, which is the single-subject rule, and ask for a ruling with respect to the germaneness of this amendment to -- I'm sorry -- Article IV, Section 8 of the Illinois Constitution, with respect to the -- the single-subject rule.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Again, Senator Demuzio, the Chair did anticipate your -- your concern, and the Chair for -- therefore rules that this amendment is germane. Senator Demuzio.

## SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Mr. President, what we are -- the germaneness question is relevant to the single-subject rule, Senate Rule 7-13, where a number of additional subject matters were -- were added to this particular amendment, and therefore, you have, in fact, ruled, and the ruling has been sustained with respect to the germaneness question. I am now, now, asking as to whether or not this -- this resolution -- this motion is in order with respect to 7-13, this issue with respect to the single-subject rule, and would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator, the -- the ruling has already had been made. The

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

appealing -- your appeal was voted on and was defeated, and we'll therefore move on to further business. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Carroll.

#### SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just first, on the parliamentary inquiry, at least as I heard it, or if not, let me express it differently. I understand you ruled on the issue of germaneness, ruling which my vote shows I disagreed with. But Article IV, Section 8(d) of the Constitution goes to a different issue than whether or not an amendment is germane, and that's the simple requirement that it must be a single subject. Article IV, Section 8(d) of the Constitution expressly provides, "Bills, except bills for appropriations and for...codification, revision or rearrangement of laws, shall be confined to one subject." Clearly this is more than one subject, as read by the Secretary, would suggest, on a parliamentary inquiry, that this motion is out of order under Article IV, Section 8(d) and would ask for a ruling of the Chair on that subject, and then, should the ruling be what I expect it to be, would then ask for further recognition.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Carroll, the ruling has already been made. Senator LaPaille. Senator Carroll, the appeal in Senator Demuzio's request was already made. Senator Carroll.

#### SENATOR CARROLL:

...(microphone cutoff)...you, Mr. President. I think there were two questions. One was on germaneness, and one was on single subject. Your ruling was on germaneness. If you would make the same ruling on single subject so I could appeal that, it would be a separate ruling, I believe. And I think your Parliamentarian would have to agree that there were two separate issues raised.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Carroll, the -- the ruling has been made. Senator

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

LaPaille.

#### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Mr. President, to clarify the record from the previous bill, and then to have some questions on this bill. The -- the issue that I rose on in the last bill was: Why be doing this now? I'll be voting for the final package, Senator McCracken. I've known that from day one. And you'll probably be voting for the final package too. I told our Leader six weeks ago: Whatever you and the Speaker come up with, you can count me on board. But by doing a negotiated process, some of your targets wouldn't be forced to be voting on this. I care for some of your targets; I've been fond of some of those targets - the freshman targets. But today's action requires them to walk the plank, and that's what I was talking about. With regard to the radio. I didn't pay for the radio. Those stations just gobbled it up all day today. So we didn't have to pay for that radio. But on this bill, Senator -- would Senator Watson yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator LaPaille.

#### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Senator Watson, on Friday, December 7th, 1990, reported by Dan Egler, the Governor's current Press Secretary, the lead says: Governor-elect Jim Edgar said Thursday he will decide whether to support user fees and tax increases which amount to tax increases on a case-by-case basis, and that he will veto them unless they are approved by a sixty-percent vote of the General Assembly. Has the Governor told you that he will veto this? Because it will probably only receive thirty-two votes today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

## SENATOR WATSON:

No, he has not.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Your -- Senator LaPaille.

#### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

... (microphone cutoff)...then, in summary, I think we should all watch the action of the Governor, because if this does receive thirty-six votes, he's going directly against his pledge to stand behind the tax accountability amendment that he signed up on, and said that he would veto if bills to raise taxes or user fees aren't passed by an extraordinary majority in both the House In closing, I'd like to draw your attention to the and Senate. National Taxpayers' United of Illinois, and let's talk about honesty and responsibility in this Chamber. Let's talk about that a little bit. So, the Taxpayers' Protection Pledge - certain people signed this pledge when they were running for State Senator. Certain people said that they would not support four-hundred-and-fifty-million-dollar income tax surcharge or the cigarette tax increase. Those Senators might be over there, may be voting for this, but I think they'll stand by their pledge, because they did sign a pledge to their voters and -- and to this National Taxpayers' United of Illinois, Jim Tobin, who I think is a pretty good friend of your side - I know he's not a good friend side: Senator Walter Dudycz, Senator O'Malley, Senator Mahar, Senator Lauzen, Senator Raica, and Senator Syverson. people said that they would not vote for then four four-hundred-and-fifty-million-dollar tax surcharge. That "No surcharge, no cigarette tax." This group said, "No said, surcharge": Judy Baar Topinka, Peter Fitzgerald, Steve Rauschenberger, Dan Cronin. And then there's one person who said, income tax surcharge, no cigarette tax." And you know who that is? The father of this package: Senator Pate Philip. know you'll stand behind your pledge here. You want to go back this weekend and tell your voters, "I did what I pledged.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

didn't vote for a billion-dollar tax increase." So, good luck.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, Senator Watson, a very -- very minor point. I know when you -- when you take a tax increase of a billion dollars in that some of the smaller parts might get lost. specifically, there is in the bill, you indicated, a change in the definition of "neglect". And this was something that was bill that I sponsored for the Department. We had a conference committee, and because of vociferous opposition by the quardian, Patrick Murphy, we took this change out of that -- of that conference committee. I know what you're -- what you're trying to do; I know what the goal is. The goal is to avoid having to pay foster parents' dollars to relatives. But the problem with the wording of the language is that you can have a -a woman who is a drug addict or who is mentally disturbed and have who has a child, to drop that child off with a grandmother or an aunt and say, "I'll be right back," and then they don't come a month. Because of the language that's in this bill, you can't charge them with being neglect. This is what the conference committee, and I know this bill went through a committee today. I doubt that when you got a billion-dollar tax increase that something this small is going to be discussed in that committee, but assuming that this language does not get passed by the House, I would just raise this issue with you right now so that if we are going to take it up on another conference committee, that we have a full discussion of it - in -- in committee. It is definitely a problem. The public quardian has been very active this year, and everyone's been giving him a lot of attention. This is a bad provision that could come back to -to haunt us, I -- I think. I know what the goal is: to make sure

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

that people aren't getting extra money for foster care. But the way this is drafted has a real problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close, sir?
SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you. Yes. Just to -- to respond to Senator Cullerton...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

I'm -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I didn't see your light, Senator Jones. I'm sorry, Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Т opposition to the amendment and one portion of the amendment in particular, as it relate to the cigarette increase. We hear all the talk about health-related issues and -as relate to cigarette tax. But I think more people end up in the hospital for -- for cardiac arrest or problems with their arteries they have poor eating habits. based on the fact that notice there is no tax on the fast foods; there is no tax on all the beef and meat that you eat, or high-cholesterol foods, or no tax on fat people because they go to the hospital for wrong type of food. So I can't see why you just single out one particular industry to place a tax on. And on top of that, even the Governor stopped eating fast food, if you recall, because he had a problem with high cholesterol in his arteries, but you didn't place a tax on that. So what I'm saying to you is that this very regressive tax that you are placing on a industry, which will cause increased bootlegging on all our border states, There is no growth in this tax. It is the most unfair tax that can be imposed, and I know the people of district down in Southern Illinois don't want this tax, because you're going to drive many merchants - many, many merchants - out

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

of business, the small retail ma-and-pa shops on the borders of the State of Illinois. So it's a very regressive tax, and I ask the Members on this -- this side to reject this amendment by soundly voting No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson, to close.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, and just to address some of the Senator Cullerton mentioned. We share concerns that concerns, and we understand that the -- especially the situation that you mentioned would be considered dumping. The Department feels that that is dumping, and that would be considered neglect. But we do share some of those concerns, and I think that they do need to be addressed. I -- I don't know that we've ever done anything more onerous in the -- in the fourteen years that I've served the people of my district than when we established the so-called granny tax: six dollar and thirty cents per day for those people who've saved all their lives and created a situation by which they would hopefully spend their elder years in dignity. what do we do? We create a tax: six dollars and thirty cents per day. I've probably received more mail on that anything in the fourteen years that I've served. We're trying to address that concern of the seniors in this State. And we're addressing it - sure, with a tax increase; and that tax increase happens to fall on cigarettes. There's no popular tax increase. popular when you talk about increasing an individual's taxes. But I think when you talk about health care issues and you talk about health care concerns, I think cigarettes create a health care problem. So why not tax that problem? The surcharge. Well, let me just quickly mention -- and something that didn't get brought up -- the Hospital Association and the -- the Medicaid assessment on hospitals. Those of you that live in the rural

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

area, under the previous legislation, fifty-four hospitals were exempt under the language of the bill. This legislation increases number to eighty-eight. Primarily those hospitals in rural areas defined by the Federal Government and HCFA are exempt. No tax. no responsibility. They're exempted. The surcharge. On June 30th, the surcharge expires, and it was said earlier, the units of government were told from the very beginning that this was going to be a temporary source of revenue - don't count on it. Well, what have we done? We've added twenty percent to be distributed to units of local government. Sure, that's not what they want. They'd like to have more. But we're at least providing a continuing source of a revenue and ultimately going to one-eleventh, which will be permanent. It isn't what they want, probably everything in this bill is something and it is -have a problem with, but we're trying to be somebody may responsible. Local governments will continue to receive a flow of dollars from the State of Illinois, an increase in dollars over what they would have got once this expired. The budget. was surprised at the reaction of some on the other side, when we talk about increase in funding for education. A hundred forty-five million dollars of increased funding for education. Most of us campaigned on establishing education as a priority. would imagine that if you looked over the last ten years, a hundred-and-forty-five-million-dollar increase is verv substantial, and the people in education feel very supportive of a hundred and forty-five million, and probably feel right now there'll never be anything greater than a hundred and forty-five. Sure, we'd like to have more. And we'd like to be able to provide our units of local government with more money. But I think every now and then, you have to be responsible, and some of the comments that I've heard on the Floor today were not responsible, Senator -- comments from responsible Senators. It was the height of

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

hypocrisy, some of the comments that I've heard. This is an approach to be responsible, to try to solve a problem in the State of Illinois, and I think we should support it. And I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 282. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that vote, there are 32 Ayes, 25 Nays. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. ...(microphone cutoff)...Watson, on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 282. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 282.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. I would just ask for your continued support. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of parliamentary inquiry, different from the point made before. This bill has now not been read, since we changed its title -- the title has not been read on three legislative days. Article IV, Section 8(b) <sic>, of the

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Constitution provides, and I quote, "A bill shall be read by title on three different days in each house." And in the case of Gege's Cafe versus the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, the Supreme Court was very clear in advising us that a violation of this provision could render the legislation void. This legislation -- its title was just changed. It therefore has not been read on three separate legislative days. And I would suggest to the Chair that it violates Article IV, Section 8, and ask for a ruling that it is out of order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

...(microphone cutoff)...Carroll, the Chair rules that the Constitutional provision cited by you has been complied with, and I would therefore ask if you wish to appeal the Chair. Very good. Senator Carroll has appealed the ruling of the Chair. The question is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Those in favor of sustaining the ruling, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that vote, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, and the ruling of the Chair is sustained. Further discussion? Senator Shaw.

#### SENATOR SHAW:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to ask the sponsor one question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Shaw.

# SENATOR SHAW:

Does the people of your district want all of these taxes and support this -- this tax increase, in terms of cigarette tax, Senator Watson?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

Well, I've heard from people on both sides of the issue. Naturally, not everybody in my district, two hundred thousand strong, march to the tune of the cigarette tax or the surcharge - making it permanent. I mean, there's people that feel both sides of this issue, as they probably do in your district too, Senator. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the speaker yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Watson, can you show -- tell us where in your legislation does it guarantee that the six dollar and thirty cents will be reduced from the current rate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

The Statute sunsets on June 30th - six-dollar-and-thirty-cent-per-day granny tax.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Hendon.

# SENATOR HENDON:

Yes. I understand that it sunsets, but where -- is there a guarantee in here that the nursing homes will not just continue or just blend that six dollars and thirty cents into their regular rate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, on most nursing homes, I understand that the six dollar

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

and thirty cents is an add-on at the end of a monthly statement -monthly bill that's sent out. So that would be eliminated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Watson, you -- Senator Jones? Senator Jones.

#### SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. And -- before addressing the issue, you know, I'm very shocked at your rulings. I didn't know that we could take three days and compile it into one day, as relate to this subject matter of being read on three consecutive But as relate to the issue, I urge the Members on this side to again vote No, because this issue will be revisited, and again, we have the most regressive of any tax that can be imposed on people. You -- what we are doing is taking -- attempting to take poor people to pay for rich people - Robin Hood in reverse - and you're pitting the wealthy hospitals against the poor hospitals. This does no good for the people of the State of Illinois. And, again, there is a great possibility, even though this may pass and may be become law - which I doubt very seriously - they still can pass through that dollar increase, Senator Watson, that you have in a rate increase to the senior citizens. There is no quarantee that that is not going to happen. So I ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson, to close.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Well, wrong - the previous speaker. That dollar per bed - it's built into the Statutes. You cannot pass that on as a -- as a rate increase. I -- I mean -- I've talked before about this, and I won't dwell on it, but I -- again, I think that ultimately in the end, hopefully, this is -- this is the package that prevails. You know, we had some questions about that, certainly when -- when the House will address this issue. But I do think --

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

and I know that the Members on this side of the aisle have deliberated very hard and long on this issue, and we discussed it in great deal in caucus, and a lot of people had some real problems and concerns about the method by which we are about to pass this legislation. But once I think everybody realized the responsibility that we have of being a majority, and the responsibility that we have of being elected to serve the people of this State, that you realize that sometimes maybe you don't want to do what you've got to do. But in this particular case, this is the -- the responsible thing to -- to do. This is the best approach to the problem that you'll see over the next, hopefully, only five days. And I ask for your continued support. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The question is, shall House Bill 282 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 25 Nays, 1 Member voting Present. House Bill 282, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Messages from the House.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 56.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 56)

Adopted by the House, June 24, 1993.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

the immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 56. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. And the rules are suspended. Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd move for the adoption of House Joint Resolution No. 56, which is our adjournment resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver has moved the adoption of House Joint Resolution 56. Those in favor, vote -- say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is adopted.

# SECRETARY HARRY:

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, 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 947, with House Amendments 1 and 2.

Passed the House, as amended, June 24, 1993.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Resolutions.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 647, offered by Senator Demuzio, as is Senate Resolution 648.

Senate Resolution 649, offered by Senator Topinka.

They're all congratulatory, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Consent Calendar. We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all of those read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, have there been any objections filed to any resolutions on the Consent Calendar?

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

There have been no objections filed, Mr. President.

67th Legislative Day

June 24, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. Resolutions.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 650, offered by Senator Demuzio.

It's substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

...(microphone cutoff)...further business? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to remind the Members, it is 12 o'clock, noon, Monday, for the Senate. Some people indicated that it was 3 o'clock. I think the House comes back at 3 on -- on Monday. The Senate comes back at noon on Monday. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

That is correct.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Noon on Monday. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Yes, sir. Any further business to come before the Senate?

The Senate will stand adjourned till noon, Monday, June 28th.

Have a nice weekend.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001 STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

# DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 24, 1993

HB-0005	RECALLED		1	PAGE	7
HB-0005	THIRD READ!	NG	1	PAGE	44
HB-0282	RECALLED		]	PAGE	45
HB-0282	THIRD READ!	NG	1	PAGE	57
SR-0636	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	1	PAGE	5
SR-0637	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0638	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0639	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0640	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0641	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0642	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0643	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0644	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0645	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0646	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
SR-0647	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	62
SR-0648	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	62
SR-0649	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	62
	RESOLUTION			PAGE	63
HJR-0003	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7
HJR-0053	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	5
HJR-0054	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	1
HJR-0056				PAGE	61
	RESOLUTION			PAGE	61
SJR-0079	RESOLUTION	OFFERED		PAGE	7.

94/11/29

14:02:51

# SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-SENATOR GEO-KARIS	PAGE	1
JOURNAL-POSTPONED	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
AT EASE	PAGE	4
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	4
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	5
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	5
AT EASE	PAGE	6
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	6
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	6
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	61
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	62
RESOLUTIONS CONSENT CALENDAR-ADOPTED	PAGE	62
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	63