79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "The House will come to order. Members should be in their seats. The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived long ago, please come to order, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Chaplain for today is the Reverend James Woods. He is from the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Decatur. Reverend Woods is the guest of Representative Dunn. We invite our guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Reverend Woods: "Would you pray with me? Heavenly Father, we thank You for this assembly and we invite You today to be our school teacher. Instruct our hearts, Father, in the ways of righteousness according to the precepts of Your law. Father, we thank You that with the psalmist we have the right to say today that Jehovah is King. He is robed in majesty and strength, the world is His throne. Oh Lord, You have reigned from prehistoric times from everlasting. The mighty oceans thunder Your praise, You're mighty. More mighty than all the breakers pounding on the seashores of the world. Your royal decrees cannot be changed. Holiness is forever the keynote of Your reign. We pray these things in Jesus' name. Amen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp, would you lead us in the pledge, please?"
- Ropp, et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the record show that
  Representative Johnson is excused today? Representative
  Black is excused today and just for the knowledge of the
  Members of the Assembly, Representative Black had a very

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- good night, and he's getting better, and on behalf of the family I want to thank you all for your prayers and to keep him in your prayers. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, are there any excused absences from the Democratic side?"
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, there are none on this side of the aisle."
- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you. Have all answered the Roll Call?

  Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 people answering the Roll

  Call, a quorum is present. Representative Klemm, for what
  reason do you rise?"
- Klemm: "Madam Speaker, I just want to take a moment and thank all my colleagues for their phone calls and cards wishing me well with my back surgery after the veto session, and I'm coming along well, and I want to thank them all for their kindness and...glad to be back."
- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you. We're glad you're back. The Chair now recognizes Representative Weller for a special introduction. Representative Weller."
- Weller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure for me today to play host to the State Class 1A Cross Country Team, the Seneca Irish. I'd like to ask the coach of the Seneca Cross Country team to make the introduction of the team and tell a little bit about the team. It's...since... a Resolution, which I'll be offering soon was drafted, Coach Jim Helton was also named by his colleagues in the coaches for the Class 1A as Coach of the Year. So let's give a warm welcome to the Class 1A Cross Country Champs for Illinois, the Seneca Irish."
- Coach Helton: "Thank you, Representative Weller and I want to thank you for this honor and opportunity to come down here with my team. I'd like to introduce my team. From my right I have senior Brad Peterson who is also an All-State

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

runner for us. Mikel Ferri, a Junior, All-State. Matt Bowles, a sophomore. Dan Patterosi, a senior. Mike Larson, a senior. Jeff Lavier, a senior. Mike Weavey, a senior and Greg Punke a junior who is also All-State. This was only our fourth year of Cross Country here at Seneca, and we feel like we've made dramatic progress in only four years. We have become the only State Champion in LaSalle County in the boys programs of any sport and we feel very happy to represent LaSalle County and our communities of Seneca and Mazon. I say Mazon because we are involved in the cooperative sports programs with Mazon High School and without that probably this wouldn't have become possible. Again, thank you very much. This is an honor and something that I'm sure that we'll remember. Thank you."

- Weller: "Thank you, Coach. I'd like to offer House Resolution 1243. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution?"
- Clerk Leone: "WHEREAS, The Seneca High School cross country team has enjoyed much success during its young career; and

WHEREAS, The team, which was established in 1986, has advanced to sectionals all four years; and

WHEREAS, The team made it to State competition the past two years; and

WHEREAS, The eleven-member team's motto in 1989 was "Climb in 1989"; and

WHEREAS, The summit of the symbolic mountain was the State meet; and

WHEREAS, Mikel Ferri, Greg Punke, and Brad Peterson were All-State runners, placing 5th, 13th and 21st, respectively, at the State meet; and

WHEREAS, During the past two years, Seneca High School has

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

participated in a cooperative athletic program with

Mazon-Verona-Kinsman High School; and

WHEREAS, This cooperative effort has provided the cross country program with more athletes and friendships, as well as raised the level of competition within the team; and

WHEREAS, The joint effort opened up lines of communication and led to the consolidation of the two school districts, which will be effective in the fall of 1990; and

WHEREAS, The co-op also allowed some athletes to run cross country who wouldn't have been able to otherwise; and

WHEREAS, The Seneca High School cross country team won the 1989 State Championship; and

WHEREAS, The honor is the first boys' State championship at Seneca High School and the first boys' State championship in any sport in LaSalle County; and

WHEREAS, The team's achievements can be credited to hard work, determination and talent, as well as the guidance of Head Coach Jim Helton and Assistant Coach George Oswald; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we do hereby congratulate the Seneca High School cross country team on its 1989 State championship; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we commend them for their efforts, drive to succeed and competitive spirit; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we wish them continued success both on the field and in the classroom; and be it further

RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be presented to the members of the team and Coaches Helton and

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Oswald."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I ask for the approval of the House of Representatives for this Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'. 'Nays'? 'Ayes' have it. Congratulations to the State Champions, the Class lA State Champions, the Irish of Seneca."

Speaker Breslin: "Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1255, Stephens. 1259, Turner, et al. 1260, Cowlishaw. 1261, Balanoff, 1262, Hasara. Hicks. 1264, McPike-Madigan. 1265, Ronan-1267, Hallock and Giorgi. 1268, Woolard. Bugielski. 1269, Hallock and Giorgi. 1272, Stern. 1273, Hannig. 1275, Currie. 1274, Hannig. 1276, Cullerton. Bugielski. House Joint Resolution 82, Cullerton. House Joint Resolution 83, Olson; and Senate Joint Resolution 115, Weller."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I did want to make note that one of them, House Resolution 1264 by McPike honors Coach Lucco for being named by the Belleville News-Democrat, Southern Illinois' Sports Hall of Fame, so I think we ought to congratulate our good friend Joe Lucco for again being honored in the Hall of Fame and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "Congratulations to Joe Lucco. The question is,

  'Shall the Agreed Resolutions be adopted?' Hearing no
  objections, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death
  Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1246, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, in respect to the memory of Everett Percy.

  House Resolution 1271, offered by Representative LeFlore, in respect to the memory of Linell Nelson of Chicago and

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- House Resolution 1278, offered by Representative Currie, in respect to the memory of Magnolia Smith."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1256, offered by Representative Bowman, et al. House Resolution 1257, offered by Representative Bowman, and House Resolution 1270, offered by Representative Flowers, et al."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Laurino in the Chair. Committee on Assignments. We'll now proceed to the Supplemental Calendar #1, Amendatory Veto Motions, Senate Bill 1096, Representative Breslin. Representative Breslin on Senate Bill 1096."
- Breslin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move the adoption of the Governor's Amendatory Veto on Senate Bill 1096. The Governor deleted some Bills, one dealing with retaliatory discharge, the other dealing with some pension articles and a third dealing with gubernatorial appropriation recommendations. This Bill is in compliance with the statutory requirement...the Constitutional requirements for amendatory vetoes, and I move for the adoption of these Amendatory Veto items."
- Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1096?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, 111 to 0, the Motion is

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change....and Item Veto Motions on the Regular Calendar, page 3. House Bill 1211, Representative Hallock. Representative Hallock on House Bill 1211. of the record, Mr. Clerk. On House Bill 1211 the Regular Calendar, page 4, Representative Richmond on Motion Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Proceeding to Motion 11, Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps on Motion 11 on House Bill 1211. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Phelps on Motion 12. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Woolard, Motion #13. Out of the #14, Representative Woolard. record, Mr. Clerk. Motion Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Hicks, Motion #19. Representative Hicks. Motion #19 on House Bill 1211. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Wennlund on House Bill 1211, Motion #21. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1211, Representative Young, Motion #23. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On House Bill 1211, Representative Lou Jones on Motion #26. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On House Bill 1211, Representative Young on Motion #27. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. on page 4 of the Calendar, House Bill 1211, Representative Woolard on Motion #13. Representative Woolard."

- Woolard: "Yes. I'd like leave to...or I would appreciate consideration of Motion #13. This is \$350,000 for an outdoor recreation facility at the City of Herrin. I think this will serve the needs of the people of southern Illinois in a very fashionable fashion and I would appreciate your consideration."
- Speaker Laurino: "Are there any questions? Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Motion...shall this item pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 63 'aye', 48 'nay', 0 'present', fails. Representative Woolard on Motion #14."
Woolard: "This is \$250,000 for the City of Marion. This is a much needed improvement in the roads system in order to accommodate the off traffic of route 57 coming south on route 13. There's economic development involved here, and I think it's very important that we pass this issue. It's very important to the wellbeing of the people of southern Illinois. Appreciate your consideration."

Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none...hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this item pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 66 'aye', 48 'nay' and 1 voting 'present', fails. Further Motions?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson. Mr. Peterson. We're ready to go to Senate Bill 1466 if you're ready. Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen on page 2 of your Calendar under Senate Bills Third Reading is Senate Bill 1466. This Bill is going to be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does Representative Peterson have leave for that? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Peterson now asks to suspend the rule...he is suspending the appropriate rule so that Amendments...the Amendments do not have to be printed and distributed. We realize that that is a very unusual request for this Assembly, but this is a revisory Bill, the Amendment is very large. As you can see, the Clerk has the Amendment, it is extremely large. On the question of the

# 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Motion to suspend the rule not to print this revisory Amendment, who wishes to seek recognition? No one. In that case, the question is, 'Shall the rule be suspended?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed...Representative Hultgren on the question. Excuse me."

- Hultgren: "Do you intend to proceed today on a Third Reading vote on this?"
- Speaker Breslin: "We do intend to proceed immediately on the
  Third Reading request, but I would suggest that we listen
  very carefully to Representative Peterson and hopefully,
  there will be no problems with that. Okay?
  Representative David Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair.

  Since it's such a lengthy Amendment, is it controversial in

  nature?"
- Speaker Breslin: "It is not controversial. It is a revisory
  Bill. One of those large Bills that are not supposed to
  have substantive changes in them. So on the question of
  the suspension of the rule, hearing no objection, leave is
  granted. The Bill is now on the Order of Second Reading.
  Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1466. A Bill for an Act to revise the law, combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative William Peterson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "Madam Speaker, I ask leave of this body to have both Amendments 1 and 2 heard simultaneously."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked leave that Amendments 1 and 2 be heard at the same time. Is there any objection?

  Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Proceed,
  Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the latest

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

revisionary Bill which is periodically recommended by the Legislative Reference Bureau. It combines multiple provisions passed into law in 1989 in both the spring and fall sessions. I ask for your approval of Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1466. Are there any questions? Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "Do you know how many pages is in those Amendments, just out of curiosity?"

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you advise us?"

Clerk Leone: "There are over 1200 pages."

Goforth: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further questions? There being no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1466?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, both Amendments are adopted. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "There are no further...Representative Stephens.

The Amendments are adopted. There being no further

Amendments, the Bill moves to Third Reading.

Representative Peterson now asks leave for immediate

consideration of this Bill as amended. Representative

Hultgren on that question."

Hultgren: "My question is, I understand the problem of the length and so forth. Is there any reason that it needs to be considered today and couldn't wait until March, for example? And perhaps the Sponsor could explain why."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Yes. As I mentioned before, we're talking about revisions of multiple provisions that were passed into law

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

in 1989. We want these revisions to take place so those Bills that have been passed and put into law can in fact be corrected."

Hultgren: "So there's a need to correct them today?"

Peterson: "That's right."

Speaker Breslin: "See...The object is that the Bills we passed last year had some things wrong with them. Misspellings, mis...inappropriate English, et cetera..."

Peterson: "Right. Right. This corrects those problems."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. It also combines sections. Where there were 2 Amendments...Two separate Amendments to different Bills that dealt with the same section. So before those Bills go to the printers and get out to the public, this Bill is very useful if it is passed now rather than later. Any further discussion? There being no further discussion the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1466 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Read the Bill now, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1466. a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Introductions and First Readings."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2906, offered by Representative Weller,
  a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading
  of the Bill. House Bill 2907, offered by Representative
  Kulas and Giorgi, a Bill for an Act in relationship to
  medical and family responsibilities. First Reading of the
  Bill. House Bill 2908, offered by Representative

#### 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2909, offered by Representative Preston, et al., a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the House Bill 2910, offered by Representative Bowman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2911, offered by Representative Morrow and Stange, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2912, offered Representative Giglio and Balanoff, a Bill for an Act to add sections to the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2913, offered by Representative Giglio, et al., a Bill for an Act to the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2914, offered by Representative Weller, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading House Bill 2915, offered by of the Bill. Representative Weller, a Bill for an Act to promote drug free work places. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2916, offered by Representative Flinn, et al., a Bill for an Act in relationship to narcotics. First Reading of the House Bill 2917. offered by Representative Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. 2918, offered by Representative Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Code of Civil Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2919, offered by Representative Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2920, offered by Representative Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2921, offered by Representative Anthony Young, a

# 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2922, offered by Representative Curran, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2923, offered by Representative Ronan and McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giglio in the Chair. On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 1276. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1276. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representatives Wolf and Cullerton."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move for adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1276. And in effect what the Amendment does, it strikes all provisions under the Bill and the Amendment becomes the Bill. What the Amendment does is it gives the State Universities Retirement System the authority to issue bonds up to a maximum of ten million dollars for the purpose of constructing a facility with which to house the State University Pension System. That building would also be of sufficient size to house other facilities which would enable this to not only be a facility for the housing of the pension system, but to provide for an investment as well. Now the other systems...the other 4 systems of the state funded systems do not have the cap of \$575,000 that the State University System does. Therefor, in one other

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- case, a facility that is being constructed in Springfield right now, that system only had to get an opinion from the Attorney General's office to go ahead and construct the facility that they were desiring to construct. On that basis, I would move that we adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1276."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1276."
- Speaker Giglio: "Heard the Gentleman's Motion. Does the Gentleman have leave by the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now move for the passage of Senate Bill 1276. I think it's been discussed. The Amendment was discussed on Second Reading, and I would urge your support."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1276 pass?'

  All those in favor signify...excuse me. The Gentleman from

  Cook, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  We have looked over this Bill, and we do not find that it
  has any problems. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1276 pass?'

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'.

  This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional...required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House and use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose so that the Rules Committee may meet while the Legislature...while the House is in session for the purpose of hearing House Bill 2431 and Senate Bill 971 in Rules Committee in the Speaker's. conference.."
- Speaker Giglio: "Would you...excuse me, Mr...Would the lobbyists

  please remove themselves from the floor immediately? Mr

  Bruce..."
- Matijevich: "...so that the Rules Committee can meet immediately?

  This has been cleared on both sides of the aisle."
- Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Munizzi, are you seeking recognition? I would like to remind the Members that that huge card for Representative Black who's been ill, is still in the back of the chambers on the Republican side near the coat rack back there, so we'd like to have all Members sign it, put a little thought on it for Representative Black to have a speedy recovery. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary.

  'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 745 together with the attached Amendments hereto has been printed by the Senate and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Representatives, to wit: Passed the Senate as amended January 11th, 1989 (sic - 1990). Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.' A further message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 2431 together with the attached Amendments and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Passed the Senate as amended January 11th, 1989 (sic -1990). Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.' from Rules Committee. The Committee on Rules has pursuant to rule 29(c)3 the following Bills have been ruled exempt on January 11th, 1990: House Bill 2431 and Senate Bill 971."

- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Laurino in the Chair. The House will come to order. Supplemental Calendar #2, Senate Bill 572, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record for a moment, Representative Giorgi. House will come to order. Supplemental Calendar #3. House Bill 745, Representative Trotter. Mr. Clerk, we'll handle House Bill 745, the Motions. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Motion to take from the table. Pursuant to rule 74(a) I move to take Bill...House Bill 745 from the table, suspend rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the order of Concurrences. Filed by Representative Trotter."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Trotter on the Motion on House Bill 745."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur with the Senate's Motion for acceptance of the Amendment that just passed over there, I understand.

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Amendment #4."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? This is a Motion to take from the table, any discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman asks leave of the House for the Attendance Roll Call. Does he have leave? Leave is granted to take from the table and suspend rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the order of Concurrences. Order of Concurrences, House Bill 745, Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this august body. As you know, House Bill 745 was passed out of this chamber in the last fall session. What we asked for then was that we get some relief for the women and children of our state. We did pass the Bill here and it went to the Senate. The people in the Senate were not as visionary as we were and as a consequence it did not pass. However, the federal government did see that there was a need that the women and children did receive some kind of relief through the courts. And particularly what they have said is that they wanted to raise the eligibility standard to 130 percent from its previous 100 percent standing and to raise the age limit in which children can receive benefits to the age of 6. We of course want more, but we are willing to accept the standard of the federal government and want our state also to be in compliance with that standard, and ask that everyone today vote 'aye' with that compliance."

Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments...Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 745?! everybody...on that question, that question, anybody...signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Showing 113

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

'ayes' 0 voting 'nay' and 0 voting 'present' the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 745 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, House Bill 2431, a Motion. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "Motion on House Bill 2431. Pursuant to Rule 74(a),

I move to take from the Table, suspend Rule 79(e), and
place on the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences. Filed
by Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Amendment to House Bill 2431 is necessary House. because of enacted...late last June we passed Senate Bill 952, this is some clean-up language. That legislation, among other things, amended Chapter 85 to limit the investment authority of public treasurers. The Bill, which Public 86-426, became Act reduced the types of classifications of short term obliqations. House Bill 2431 as amended would revert to the three classifications and would increase the cap on investments in commercial paper to one-third of public agency funds. I ask for its adoption. This just passed out of the Senate 52 to nothing. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion?

Seeing none, the Gentleman asks leave of the House for the
Attendance Roll Call on his Motion to take from the Table,
suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the Order
of Concurrences. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave
being granted, the Motion is adopted by the Attendance Roll
Call. House Bill 2431, on the Order of Concurrences.
Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask for an affirmative Roll Call on HB 2431."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks for...the question is. 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to Senate Bill (sic, House Bill) 2431?' To concur all those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. House Bill 2431 having received 108 'aye' votes, 0 filmrk. 'no', voting and **7**2 voting 'present'. The House...Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I would like to be recorded voting 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Cullerton wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Same thing."

Speaker Laurino: "Record Representative Dunn as voting 'aye'. Representative Wait wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Anyone else seeking recognition? None. No one else, okay. There's 111 'aye' votes, O voting 'nay' and 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in the adoption of Senate #1 Amendment to House Bill 2431. Representative Ropp...wishes t.o be recorded as voting Representative Martinez wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Anybody else seeking recognition to be voted 'aye'? you, There are 113 'ayes', O voting 'nay', and 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2431 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3 under the Motions is Senate Bill 525, Representative Saltsman. the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion. I move to suspend rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports

Senate Bill 525. Filed by Representative Saltsman."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Saltsman on Senate Bill 525, on

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

your Motion."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I vote to concur with Senate Bill 525. This increases our enterprise zone by 7 and puts us at a total of 81 and this is being presented due to the high total of requests for enterprise zones. I ask for its passage."

Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman asks leave of the House with the Attendance Roll Call to suspend rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports Senate Bill 525. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave being granted the Attendance Roll Call, Senate Bill 525 will be placed on the order of Conference Committee Reports. Alright, on Senate Bill 525, Representative Saltsman Conference...adoption of the Conference Committee Reports. First Conference Committee Report. Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the explanation was very well accepted by the General Assembly. I just ask for its passage."

Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion on...he wishes the... Is there any discussion? Representative Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This issue has been satisfactorily resolved to the concerns of all those who had a strong interest in it just a couple of hours ago, and we would join Representative Saltsman in moving for approval."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

McNamara: "Thank you. I'm a little bit confused by the language of this, and maybe you can just clarify it a little bit.

This does not increase enterprise zones, is that correct?"

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Saltsman: "It increases it by seven."

McNamara: "Okay. How many are we authorized right now?"

- Saltsman: "This'll put our total at 81. So that means we have 64...I mean, excuse me...we will have 81. We have 74 at the present time."
- McNamara: "Okay. Does it increase an amount annually? that the 81 is the total amount in the State of Illinois. Does it...does it indicate an annual amount that...Originally, we were annually limited 10 enterprise zones per and that was increased year subsequently in this General Assembly. I want to know what effect it has on that."
- Saltsman: "It does not limit the amount. We have no limit. The General Assembly can raise the cap any time they want."
- McNamara: "Well, if I read this correctly, it's anyone...the Governor can raise the amount."
- Saltsman: "No. The General Assembly has to, but he sometimes requests along with our leadership."
- McNamara: "So in effect, the 12 enterprise zone cap is still on there, and if more enterprise zones in a year were going to be brought about, then that cap would have to be raised?

  This does not affect that?"
- Saltsman: "We could raise the cap if we see necessary, and the requests are there."
- McNamara: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further questions? Seeing no discussion,

  Representative Saltsman, would you like to close?"
- Saltsman: "Just ask for an affirmative vote. This is pretty much an agreed Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill...Senate Bill 525. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Having received 105 'aye' votes, 11 'no' votes and 0 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate 525 and the Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared Supplemental Calendar #3, Senate Bill 971, Representative Currie. Just a moment, Representative Currie. There's a Motion...Mr. Clerk, read the Motion on Supplemental Calendar #1 (sic - #3) on the Motion for Senate Bill 971." Clerk Leone: "I move to suspend rule 79(e) and place on the order of Conference Committee Reports Senate Bill 971. Filed by Representative Currie."

- Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 971?

  The Motion to suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the order of Conference Committee Reports? Representative Currie asks for leave of the House by the Attendance Roll Call to have this Motion heard. Seeing that she has received the adequate number by the Roll Call of the House, the Motion is adopted. Representative Currie on Senate Bill 971."
- Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 971. The provisions of the Bill are primarily technical, responding to a problem for retail pharmacists in dealing with the new state sales tax that went into effect January first. Because prescriptions sell at prices to different buyers, HMO prices are different different from prices paid by individuals at the pharmacy counter. The way in which the Sales Tax Reform Act provided for retailers to figure out their state sales tax obligations do not apply very readily to retail pharmacists. The language in this proposal comes from the Department of Revenue. It should make no change in the dollar collections through retail pharmacists, but it does

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

apply a very different technique to the collecting of sales taxes. I would be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support for this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none. the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 971?' This is final action. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Clerk. Bugielski votes 'aye'. Edley votes 'aye'. Bill having received 115 'aye', 0 voting 'nay' and 1 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 971 and the Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the regular Calendar appears...page 3 appears House Bill 1211. Anybody that has filed a Motion override the Governor's veto on House Bill 1211, this is the last time the House is going to hear this override...your override Motions. So be prepared to handle them. If you want to take them out of the record, that's the last time you're going to get the opportunity to have this heard. The Bill...If something is overridden, the Bill must go to the Senate today, so it has to be heard today and now's the time to be prepared. House Bill 1211. Representative Hallock on Motion #5. Out of the record. Motion #8, Representative Richmond. Out of the record. Motion #11, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. #12, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. Motion #13, Representative Woolard. We already heard that. I'm sorry, Representative Woolard. Motion #19. Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks, Motion #19 on 1211. Out of the record. Motion #21, Representative Wennlund. Out of the record. Motion #23, Representative

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Younge. Out of the record. Motion #26, Representative Lou Jones. Out of the record. Motion #27, Representative Younge. Proceed, Representative Younge."

- Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Motion 27 is the Motion to override a veto for \$50,000 to the Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission called SWIM Pact. It is the southwestern area version of the NIPSI planning agency. It is a planning agency that covers some 7 counties and is responsible for the Clean Water Act and planning in reference to the United States Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, and I ask for your approval of this Motion to override the veto."
- Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Supplemental appropriation is in the same category as yesterday's. If it wasn't fair for the very first Motion that we heard, which was indeed a planning council for northeastern Illinois, it's not appropriate now, and I would ask the others to join me in not overriding the Governor's veto."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Lady's

  Motion is that 'Shall this item...the question is, 'Shall

  this item pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'

  All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those
  opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted

  who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Yes. We've called this without debate. I...It'd be a nice thing to know what is in this Bill at this time as we vote on it. Is that possible that we could see what's in and out of this Bill? Hold up a minute here?"
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Dunn, I don't believe that this

  Bill has been overridden on any of the Governor's reduction

  vetoes, and so the Bill stands as is. Representative

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Younge."

- Younge: "Mr. Speaker, may I explain my vote that this is an amount for \$50,000 for the Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission. It is a planning Commission that covers 7 counties in southwestern Illinois and it..."
- Speaker Laurino: "Okay. Representative Dunn has been satisfied.

  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take
  the record, Mr. Clerk. This motion having received 65
  'ayes', 47 'nay' and 0 voting 'present', having not
  received the required three—fifths majority, fails. The
  House Calendar, Supplemental Calendar #2, Senate Bill 572,
  Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think every Member of the General Assembly is very much aware of the riverboat gambling Bill, which is Senate Bill 572. This is the Second Corrected Conference Committee Report on 572. And I might say at the outset that this Bill isn't very different than the Bill that was on your desks June 30th, except for some minor changes. And I'd like to iust enumerate some of the changes. I think that the other underlying reason is the impetus that Iowa's forcing upon us because their boats are going to be in the river the summer after this, and if we don't do something about passing legislations, our boats won't be competing with the Iowa boats, so it behooves us to make a decision one way or But I'm going to briefly run through the Bill. The technical parts of the Bill that I think are in everybody's minds as to the dollars involved. What we do in this Bill is we create an Illinois Gaming Board within the purview of the Department of Revenue. There'll be a five member board appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate. Three people will be experts in...one in law enforcement and one in CPA and auditing and one in field of

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

law. And as a sideline, this board will eventually also assume the authority now that they don't have, to run our Bingo Licenses and Tax Act, the Charitable Games Act, which is the Las Vegas Nights, the Pull Tabs and Jars and other responsibilities delegated by the Department of Revenue. So what happens is, the Gaming Board has all the authority to enforce and to promulgate and execute the riverboat gambling law. And I'd like to notify the Speaker that at the end of the debate, I'd like to have Representative Brunsvold close in debate, and he might be aided Wyvetter Younge. Representative DeJaegher and Mrs. So what happens is anyone interested in securing a license presents a fifty thousand dollar check to the Gaming Board so that a scrutiny can be made of their background and any other information that the Gaming Board might need. And in the event they're successful, they pay twenty-five thousand dollar for a boat license and it's good for three years and they'll be able to ply the River...the Mississippi River. The...when the Act goes into effect, five licenses will be issued, four on the Mississippi and one on the Illinois River. By...the law goes into effect, it'll be into effect January 1st. The licenses'll be able to be executed 1st, 1991. The tax on riverboat gambling will be twenty percent of the adjusted gross. And twenty-five percent of that revenue we'll deposit in the newly created State Gaming Fund to be distributed to the local unit government that licenses a boat where it docks. And the percentage of the revenue that is perpetrated will appropriated by the General Assembly, the Department of Revenue for the state gaming for the administration of remainder of the funds will go...will transferred from the State Gaming Fund to the Education Assistance Fund. There'll be a two dollar admission fee

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

charge for anyone climbing aboard the boat. A dollar of that will go to the licensing authority where the boat is docked, and a dollar will go to the State Gaming Fund to be administered to the state. Now, there'll be ten licenses issued, but only five the first year. Finally, they'll be effective on January 1st of '91 four of those on Mississippi River and one for the Illinois River. remaining five are to be issued March 1st, '92. The limit...the maximum number of people...participants in any license will be twelve hundred. The limit of the value of chips that a person can get secure upon boarding a ship is five hundred dollars per trip. There'll be a five thousand dollar license fee for people that want to supply gambling equipment to the licensed shipowners, and the Gaming Board will also have authority to charge for people that want a...that want an occupational license so that they can work on the riverboats. That's the highlights of the Bill. There are no major changes from the original Bill of last summer or last June 30th, and I'll answer any questions that I'm capable of."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Churchill."

- Churchill: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield for some questions? Assuming that he will, Representative Giorgi, can you tell me, are there any caps on the amount that can be wagered under this Bill?"
- Giorgi: "Yes, five hundred dollars. The limit is five hundred dollars wagering chips."
- Churchill: "Would you...would you point out in the Bill..."
- Giorgi: "...But no member..."
- Churchill: "...where that says it. I think you've waived the cap limitation."

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- Churchill: "Individual wagers, yes."
- Giorgi: "We didn't cover the individual wagers. All we say is, when you aboard...board a boat, you're limited to five hundred dollars worth of chips. You make your own bet sizes."
- Churchill: "What hap...can you get chips from other people?"
- Giorgi: "It would be against the...the purpose of the Act if you got chips from other people. And there'll be people from the Department of Law Enforcement aboard ship and people from the Department of Revenue in the ship casino, so the state's part of enforcement will be covered by those two avenues. The Department of Police and the Department of Revenue."
- Churchill: "And how many licenses are authorized under this Bill?"
- Giorgi: "There'll be five the first year and five the second year. Ten licenses under this Bill."
- Churchill: "And how many boats can each licensee have?"
- Giorgi: "Two boats each, up to a maximum of twelve hundred passengers."
- Churchill: "Okay, so that what this really is, is the maximum limit will be twenty riverboats under this Bill?"
- Giorgi: "Correct. But only at the present time...we're specifying four on the Mississippi, one on the Illinois.

  We have to come back and legislate the other five."
- Churchill: "Alright, but up to twenty boats?"
- Giorgi: "I'm sorry. No, the Gaming Board has the authority."
- Churchill: "Alright..."
- Giorgi: "...The Gaming Board will have the authority the second year to issue additional licenses."
- Churchill: "And you have special events licenses in here. What

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

are special events licenses?"

- Giorgi: "Well, it's come to our attention that...it's come to our attention that some of the big boats out of St. Louis and out of Iowa and out of Illinois would like to maybe some day sponsor a world series of poker or world series of blackjack, and we thought we'd allow them that courtesy."
- Churchill: "Okay, but these special licenses cannot be issued for off of the riverboats, they have to be on the riverboats?"
- Giorgi: "No, no. It has to be on the river. This is riverboat...exclusively...riverboat gambling exclusively. There'll be no gambling while the boat is docked."
- Churchill: "Are there any standards set for what happens when the riverboat is docked?"

Giorgi: "Standards?"

Churchill: "Yes."

- Giorgi: "The Gaming Board...anything that you might...there's no gambling when it's docked. But the Gaming Board has authority to go in any direction they need to to enforce our intent. The Gaming Board will be five members appointed by the Governor, you'll probably know some of them personally, be confirmed by the Senate. And we've trusted the Governor up till now, we'll trust him in the future."
- Churchill: "I'm glad to hear that. In the special events licenses, are there any standards set for the issuance of special event licenses?
- Giorgi: "No. No special event...just it's up to the board to set any rules we might overlook in writing this type of legislation."
- Churchill: "Okay. And I note that under the special events licenses that any of the limitations or any of the rules in this whole Act can go out the window. That that special license doesn't have to follow the limitations of this

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Bill."

- Giorgi: "That's correct. All we're trying to do is not arrest them for having Illinoisans on the boat to participate in a world championship of poker or something."
- Churchill: "So in other words, that under a special events license, then the caps limitation would be removed..."
- Giorgi: "That's correct..."
- Churchill: "...And you could have...you could have a special events license where somebody could be authorized to get up to a half a million dollars of chips."
- Giorgi: "It's not our...it's not really our problem. We're just allowing Illinoisans to participate without penalizing, say, the Delta Queen or the...one of the larger boats on the Mississippi from conducting the spectacular. You do that all the time."
- Churchill: "Okay, but I mean...all I'm saying is, is there are no standards forthe special events licenses..."
- Giorgi: "...We get no cut from that...we get no tax from it."
- Churchill: "We can...we can issue the special...the board can issue the special events license whenever it wants to, the limitations imposed in this Bill go out the window. They can do anything they want under a special events license."
- Giorgi: "Yeah...If the...the five intelligent people appointed by the Governor that'll make up the Gaming Board feel they have to intrude on this program, they'll intrude on it."
- Churchill: "Tell me about the public referendum. Is there a public referendum in the areas where the docking will occur?"
- Giorgi: "In any participating municipality you're accounting, all it takes is a majority of the governing body."
- Churchill: "Now is that true in Iowa? Is that how they did it in Iowa?"
- Giorgi: "I have no idea. I'd rather not pattern ourselves after

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

- Iowa. They're just giving us the impetus to get our boats in the water. I think our state is so more advanced than Iowa, that I don't think we ought to compare ourselves."
- Churchill: "Okay, but I...I believe that in Iowa they actually allow the counties where the boats were going to dock to have a referendum. And if the county decided it didn't want riverboat gambling then it would be out of the program and if it decided it did want it by public referendum, all the voters in the county, then they could have riverboat gambling, but that's not in this Bill."
- Giorgi: "And I recall that out of the eight counties where they had a referendum, the vote was an approval of seventy percent..."
- Churchill: "...Okay..."
- Giorgi: "...Of the eight counties that held referendums, the vote approval was seventy percent."
- Churchill: "Right. But we're not going...we're not going to allow our people to have that same vote."
- Giorgi: "We have a..."
- Churchill: "... Even though the majority may be in favor..."
- Giorgi: "...Great Constitution in Illinois. A great number...a great array of laws and lawyers like yourself write them and I'm satisfied with that type of legalese."
- Churchill: "We love that. Who does the law enforcement on this Bill?"
- Giorgi: "State Police."
- Churchill: "Who pays for them?"
- Giorgi: "It'll come out of the...fifty thousand, owner's license,
  a supplier's license and if need be, the Department of
  Revenue will probably take some of the money from the
  seventy-five percent that...our take."
- Churchill: "Okay. According to the Bill, those fees that you're talking about that go to the State Police are for

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

investigating the licensee. That's before they get the license. But what happens if they have to come in after the licensee has the license and they have to enforce on the boat, who pays for that?"

Giorgi: "Well...you have to be a specific problem, but the board will order the State Police to do whatever has to be done in your hypothetical case, and the licensee will pay for that."

Churchill: "And does it say that in here?"

Giorgi: "...They have authority to do that. Yes, the board has authority to levy that cost."

Churchill: "Okay."

Giorgi: "Says it in the Bill."

Churchill: "I'd like...I'd just like to have you point that out to me, because I..."

Giorgi: "It's in the Bill. You can read it.
 You're...you're...first paragraph..."

Churchill: " I did read it, and I couldn't find it."

Giorgi: "Here..."

Churchill: "...I couldn't find it. If you'd just be kind enough to give me one second and point out where we have a...I just don't want to have a...you know, you're giving all the money to other people, and you're not giving any money to the state, and yet I think you're going to have the state paying for all of the enforcement of this."

Giorgi: "Repeat after me or listen to me, will you?"

Churchill: "Yeah. What page you on?"

Giorgi: "Page three, Section 5, Gaming Board. 'There's hereby established from the Department of Revenue an Illinois Gaming Board, which shall have the powers and duties specified in this Act and all other powers necessary and proper to fully and effectively to execute this Act for the purpose of administering, regulating, enforcing the system

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- of riverboat gambling established by this Act. It's jurisdiction shall extend under this Act to every person, association, corporation, partnership and trust involved in riverboat gambling operations in Illinois'."
- Churchill: "So, what's...the State Police are then going to...they're going to bill the board, and then the board's going to pay the cost of the State Police, is that how this is going to work? Are we going to have an appropriation next year for the State Police to take care of riverboat gambling?"
- Giorgi: "You want me to guarantee there won't be an appropriation
   for something else?"
- Churchill: "I would never...I never asked you to do that. I just asked what we're doing under this Bill?"
- Giorgi: "Alright. What other question do you have?"
- Churchill: "Now tell me, the fees that are collected under this Bill, where do they go?"
- Giorgi: "They all go to the Gaming Board. Except for what we specifically said goes into the administration and for the local governments. And the bulk of the...goes into the new education fund."
- Churchill: "Okay. So, the way I read this is that twenty-five percent of the revenues go to local governments under the State Gaming Fund, and then the balance of it goes into the Education Assistance Fund?"
- Giorgi: "Correct."
- Churchill: "And what is the Education Assistance Fund, just so everybody knows?"
- Giorgi: "That's the fund we created last summer when we extended the...increased the income tax and sending the money to the units of local government in education."
- Churchill: "So that was under the temporary income tax..."
- Giorgi: "That's correct..."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Churchill: "...That we created a special fund..."

Giorgi: "...We created..."

Churchill: "What happens if the fund..."

Giorgi: "...We created a new fund, so we're generating new money into that new fund."

Churchill: "What happens if the temporary income tax is not renewed?"

Giorgi: "The end of 1991."

Churchill: "What happens to it? Where does the fund go? If the fund sunsets, we're putting money into a fund that doesn't exist."

Giorgi: "There isn't...the fund is...is in full existance. We're drawing out of that fund every month. You better get up on your state legislation."

Churchill: "What happens...what happens a year from now when we come back for that...the extension of the income tax?"

Giorgi: "Well, I'm certain we're going to repeal the date. We repeal dates here every Session of the General Assembly.

That's not going to be a problem."

Churchill: "So, in other words, it's possible that that..."

Giorgi: "...It isn't possible..."

Churchill: "...Fund could go out of existence."

Giorgi: "...Unless you lose your mind. I won't lose mine."

Churchill: "Let me ask you this. On page six where it gives the board the powers. It says that the board is supposed to put all its fees into the State Gaming Fund. It doesn't say the board is going to put any money in the Education Fund. You haven't got the power to put any money in the Education Fund."

Giorgi: "That's only a transfer. Transfer the Gaming Fund into the Education Fund."

Churchill: "They don't have the power to do it. All the money goes into the Gaming Fund."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

- Giorgi: "All fees go to the Gaming Fund. The Gaming Fund gets their hands on the money every day, and then they send it to these funds. Every day...there's a report every day and every...on every cruise, on every license application, on any occupational license. It goes...the Gaming Fund reports that every day. It's a twenty-four hour report."
- Giorgi: "No, I'm not. I've read this Bill enough times to know that that's the law."

Churchill: "I think your...I think your Bill is deficient."

- Churchill: "What have we done for the chronic gamblers? What have we done for the people that are going to get hooked into gambling because of riverboat gambling? We done anything for them?"
- Giorgi: "Repeat that again?"
- Churchill: "What have we done for chronic gamblers? All through our hearings, we were always promised that in this Bill we would have some money set aside to take care of people who get hooked on gambling because of..."
- Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Churchill, please."
- Churchill: "I just need that one question answered and I'll..."

  Giorgi: "Yes. Your question is, what have we done about people that are gambling in Illinois?"
- Churchill: "What are we doing for those who..."
- Giorgi: "...What have you done about introducing legislation to repeal a parimutuel betting, the Off-Track Betting Act, the Bingo Act, the Lottery Act, Jars and Tabs Act, the Raffle Acts, what have you done about repealing those? What have you done about introducing legislation to repeal those Acts? Those are all gambling devices. Who are you kidding?"
- Churchill: "I think...I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would address

  my attention to the Chair and to the Ladies and Gentlemen

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

of the chamber, because I think that leads to the correct All this is, is an expansion of gambling. That's all this Bill is. You can say it's for development, but you don't see that in this Bill. You can say this money is going to go for the kids. It goes to a fund that disappears in a year and a half. That fund goes out of business. There are no caps on what can be gambled, and there are special licenses with no rules or regulations. Special licenses that you can take. You can do whatever you want under that special license. This Bill is riddled full of points that would cause the person on the street to have fear of what we're doing here. This is ridiculous. All this is is an attempt to expand gambling in the State of Illinois. Oh yeah, you can And now we're going to hear the arguments, this is for Whenever you want to sell something down here, you sell it on the basis of being for the kids. Just a spoonful of sugar helps the medicine go down. This be bad medicine."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Barger."

Speaker. Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Ladies and Gentlemen, normally don't involve myself in Bills that are directed to areas outside of my district because I feel that the people a district should very definitely be represent responsible for what happens in their own areas. But this has statewide implications. We are being told that this is economic development. So, what we're doing actually is the fact that we're short on a tractor factory and we don't have jobs for those hands who would normally work in a We're going to replace them with professional factory. gamblers. We're going to improve Rock Island and Moline by taking the working class people who normally work nine five, and replacing them with people who come to work at

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

nine o'clock at night and work on until two, three or four in the morning. We wonder occasionally at the value of some of the things we do. In this particular case, we are going to help school students by taking the food out of the mouths of poor children whose parents are using that money to gamble in, and then are not able to pay their rent, clothes for their children, pay for the utilities or do the things that a family is supposed to do with the money that the family brings in. I don't think this is right and I don't think any of us who are here...we...our primary purpose here is to protect the weak from the strong. Now this particular instance, what we are doing is we are providing a method for those people, who are wealthy enough and influential enough, to establish a gambling casino have the opportunity to milk from the poor people of our area the money that they have worked so hard to obtain. This is not right. Just because Sodom took on gambling, prostitution, the use of liquor and things like that, was necessary for Gomorrah to do it. And we don't really need another major rainfall in this part of the country. would wipe out the crops, and all of the farmers down south would be grossly upset. But here we are, helping a few wealthy people, a few influential people, to take advantage of their neighbors. I don't think that is anything that I would like to be a party to, and I don't think most of us would either. We worry about crime in the streets. Yet in areas where we have gambling and the drugs and liquor we increase the amount of crime. at the time when my city had no liquor sales, the crime level in Wheaton was one seventy-seventh what it was in the City of Chicago. I don't think that we are going to be improving anything. All we're doing is opening up a chance for a few wealthy people, or wealthy families of people who

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

have gained their money in whatever way they might have gained it, to take over control of the moral standards of the communities up and down the rivers. This is not a good idea. It is something that the churches would all be against. It is something that any right thinking person would be against. Let us leave the authorized gambling to our race commission, which is doing a very good job, and the bingo that is being put on by the local veterans' organizations and the churches, and let's consider that this gambling for the type it is. This isn't just one particular kind of a game, but it's the kind of ... a group of various kinds of games that can only lead to the professional gambler, who is operating the tables, taking the money away from the poor suckers that they can drag in. This is bad. The morals behind it are bad. The influence that is being exerted against the Legislators to pass this is bad. And when they are done influencing the Legislature to pass it, they will be out there influencing the gambling commission to allow them to do that which they desire to I thank you all for listening to me and I will give you ten seconds back. Thank you."

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

Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I support this Bill to take away the...the illegality of gambling on excursion boats. I do so because I believe that there is gambling in Illinois approved already in the form of the lottery and in the form of horse racing. I believe that we should not have a particular prejudice against professional gamblers. And I think that our primary goal should be to get the strong to help the weak, and I think that is what this Bill does. I look upon it as a development tool for the St. Louis-Metropolitan Illinois area riverfront. I

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

think that if excursion boats are given the permission to have gambling on them, I think that it will spur the use of excursion boats on the Illinois side of the Mississippi One of the undeveloped assets of Illinois is the Illinois side of the Mississippi River in St. Louis-Metropolitan area. I believe that much of the shortfall and difficulty in reference to raising future revenues can be corrected if we can figure particular things that would have to be done to begin a development process in that area. I know that we badly need a development process in that area, and I think that implementation of a marina and with the approval with the of the right to gamble on boats, on that river, would be a development incentive that would not only help the State of Illinois but help the 113th Legislative District and specifically help the very, very poor areas that I have been fighting to keep alive, to keep economic and to become economically stable. I think that this Bill will help our state and will help our people and will help education. And for those reasons, I ask my colleagues to support me in my efforts to get it passed. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Bill. With all respect to the Sponsor, a learned Gentleman who has done much in his career here in the General Assembly, I have to rise in opposition to your fine...what you think is a fine idea. I...you know, the previous...one of the previous speakers remarked about the benefits that it might bring to her district. The fact of the matter is that in the City of East St. Louis now, they can't handle the crime rate with their own municipal police force, so we are forced to subsidize their police force by sending the Illinois State Police in there and this would be an

# 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

interesting quirk. We could have the...now that we can have these boats docking in the East St. Louis area, I guess we'll have to bring in the Coast Guard to patrol the river. It's really going to get out of hand. The fact matter is that this issue represents what Democratic Party stands for in Illinois today. gambling and it's the party of higher taxes. remark was made that maybe this was going to give us chance to have more funds for education. That is not the case. We all know that there are a limited number of dollars that people will put at risk in qambling. Yes, we have lottery, that's gambling. Yes, we have bingo, gambling. Yes, we have parimutuel betting, that's gambling. Those dollars are being spent, and when we start to expand gambling, and that's all this is is a further expansion of gambling, we're going to draw dollars away from those funds. We're going to draw money away from the lottery where all of the profits go for education and we're going to put it in a fund where some of the profits might That's not helping the kids, that's go to education. hurting the kids in East St. Louis and throughout the State of Illinois. The Speaker...the Sponsor of the Bill was exactly right. In his words, we don't want to pattern ourselves after Iowa. And that's exactly what this Bill is trying to do, pattern ourselves after Iowa. We can't survive because they have some...some gambling Bill that we don't have? Give me a break. The hard working taxpayers of Illinois can handle paying the freight without gambling to subsidize the programs of the State of Illinois. don't need it. One of the Leaders on the other side of the aisle when asked...when asking for support on this side of the aisle, we asked the question, 'Why not Cook County?' Well, if we have it in Cook County, we're kind of afraid

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

that organized crime might take over. Come on. You think that organized crime is going to stop at the border of Cook County and not come out to the far reaches of Illinois and grasp their hands around the throats of the taxpayers and the poor victims that will be spending their last dollar, a dollar that should have gone for education, or should have gone for food, that goes for gambling? No, they'll be out there, and you can bet on it. No pun intended. Yes, the hard working taxpayers of Illinois can handle the burdens that we place on them without gambling. We don't need this. This is just another step down the path toward a more...toward a less moral society. Those things are going to happen without our influence. Why should we make it easier? Why should we encourage our...our community members to fall further into the trap of depending upon gambling and other immoral activities just to say that...well, if you give us more of your money we'll do a better job for you. I suggest that that's not the truth. Let's keep the money in the taxpayers' hands and not get into this silly program of expanding gambling in Illinois. It's just wrong."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please? Representative?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Weaver: "I commend you for your effort on trying to make sense out of a very difficult project, because it's got a lot of ins and outs on it. Just as a point of clarification on two minor areas. Part of the document says that each of the board members shall receive three hundred dollars per day..."

Giorgi: "Plus meeting expenses."

Weaver: "Yeah..."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

- Giorgi: "The law says they must meet four times a year, but they can meet at the call of themselves if they feel the matter's of extreme urgency. But they...by law they must meet four times a year. They get three hundred dollars a meeting, and they get expenses, and they have to make an annual report a year, and they have to make a report on the problems with wagering on the boat. In other words, if there's a high incidence of losses or if there's some problems associated with wagering on the boat, they are compelled to make a report to the General Assembly as to the good sense or bad sense of it."
- Weaver: "Yes. While the...while the Conference Committee Report does not specifically identify, can we assume then that your intent is that they attend these meetings to get this money? See, the report does not require..."
- Giorgi: "Well, listen, you're...you're questioning the integrity of the Governor and the Senators that confirm these people.

  I say we're going to have five intelligent people running our Gaming Board. We're going to give them a lot of work in the future. And I feel that I have seen the Governor appoint people over the years, and we're not going to have people that are going to draw pay without showing up for meetings. If you want, I'll change...I'll introduce legislation next week to correct that problem if you're worried about the caliber of people the Governor will appoint."
- Weaver: "Well, we...hopefully, we'll have a Governor in here that will use his head in those circumstances. The other...other point of clarification is...deals with a misdemeanor if an individual uses a device to project the outcome of the game. Now, there's a lot of computer software available these days, home blackjack games and so forth that I can put on my computer at home. If I learned

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

to play blackjack at home on my computer and my...and then I go aboard one of these tours and play blackjack, am I guilty of that Class A misdemeanor because I learned from a device that will predict the outcome of the game?"

Giorgi: "No, not unless you have a device on your person that changes the outcome of the game. Not that...if you become a skilled blackjack player on your own nintendo has nothing to do with this Act."

Weaver: "But it has to be with me?"

Giorgi: "It has to be on you."

Weaver: "The device has to be on you."

Giorgi: "Or else...unless NASA gives you an exclusive on something I don't know about."

Weaver: "Well, now even...even so, they've gotten so sophisticated, you've got these little hand held calculators..."

Giorgi: "Listen..."

Weaver: "...Somebody walks on board with a calculator, are they going to be in trouble?"

Giorgi: "I would say...I don't think a calculator's a problem, but I think there may be some rules by the Gaming Board to allow or disallow calculators at the table. I think Atlantic City and Las Vegas have rules and our Gaming Board, I'm sure, will be sophisticated enough to keep up with the times."

Weaver: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ewing."

Giorgi: "Yes."

Ewing: "Zeke, throughout the time we've been discussing this Bill in the House now for a number of months, I do understand and have business contacts in Rock Island-Moline area and

# 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

understand their concern about development along their river and their concern about competition with Iowa and being competitive. The thing that I wonder is, in the reasoning that went behind this Bill, why we came up with five licenses. Four, I think, on the Mississippi now and one on the Illinois. Could you amplify on that..."

- Giorgi: "...That's true. That's in the Act. That's in the Act."
- Ewing: "I mean, if this is a pilot program, or if we're trying to start this, why didn't we just go with a license at Rock Island-Moline that's competitive to Iowa and see how it works? Why do we have to go with five licenses?"
- Giorgi: "Tom, there are a lot of things we should say about. For example, Cook County's excluded. Well, the corp of engineers tell me there are twenty—one navigable rivers in Illinois, Rock being one, Fox, Chain—ofLakes. And in the future, I think the Rock River in Rockford could support some kind of an effort like this. In other words, Tom, you southern Legislators have been pretty clever over the years. You let us have an Agricultural Premium Fund that is only supported by people that go to our tracks but you people from the other hundred and one counties get your hands on the take at the window. You've been pretty good at that without having to support the tracks, the seven tracks that are viable. You know, we all want a...we all want to share the largesse, you know."
- Ewing: "Well, Representative, you're right. The southern Legislators are pretty clever and thank you. But we've allowed you to get the Ag Premium Fund pretty much away from us now and we don't have that kind of..."
- Giorgi: "We were tired of being fleeced."
- Ewing: "I guess...well, we're being fleeced now by the Ag Premium Fund. But I question beyond that. The Bill...the next

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

year we're going to go into Will County with a license and four more on the Mississippi or..."

Giorgi: "No, no. The other four I'm hoping Rock, Fox, Wabash.

There are 21 navigable rivers in Illinois, and if some of the others...communities in Illinois would like to avail themselves of these people that drive fifty to a hundred miles to spend their five hundred dollars, I think we ought to welcome them with a little reception."

Ewing: "Well, I'm going to, Mr. Speaker, make a suggestion to the Sponsor. This legislation, and I think many of us can't understand the economic competition with Iowa. But I think if this legislation were taken back to the drawing boards, and we took it down to one permit, one effort to try this on the Mississippi opposite the State of Iowa for a year, and then brought it back with some hard facts as to how going to work, what are the problems with crime, what is the benefit to this state, what is it going to the school children of this state, all of the claims they make. But they want to come in with a program that's immediately with potential gambling all grown over Illinois, or in large parts of Illinois, without ever trying to test this program in the area where it's needed...if it's needed at all, in competition to Iowa. suggest they take it back to the drawing boards, come back with a reasonable approach to this, and then maybe the greed of everybody trying to get a riverboat license wouldn't have been so heavy that it sunk the original boat. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question to the Illinois River, which I'm very concerned about. Presently in my area, we have a very large investment on a docking facility, and we have the largest paddle wheel boat that

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

operates within the State of Illinois. The ownership of this operation, along with the city and the Economic Development Commission in our area have well over a million and a half dollars invested in this program. Now if you're going to let gambling operations on riverboats operate within 80. 90 miles from this location, and the present operator does not have this option, then this man can easily go bankrupt. Let's face it, this is economic development. This is for tourism. We need it very There is opposition in my area on this issue, but it's about the same as it is in Iowa. It's about 70 percent for and about 30 percent opposed. In my actual district and not the whole tri-county area, it's probably higher than 70 percent. Now, if we got this operation and it's already presently working, a very fine facility, I don't want go backward. We should at least have opportunity to match the same licenses that'll be operating on the shores of Illinois. Missouri will soon be voting on the big Admiral ship that sits on their shore of doing the same thing we are. So if you want to catch us in the middle and not let anything happen and let Iowa and Missouri beat us to the punch, that's fine. But we should make our options open. Nobody's going to force this on the City of Peoria. They're going to have a chance to vote on But every city and village in my district, I've been contacted by mayors and village board presidents in of riverboat gambling, some that are very small and don't even have the options, probably, of affording this type of a port. I'm talking Peoria Heights, Pekin, East Peoria. The mayor and city council voted unanimously to accept They want it very bad. So, we're in a position where we don't want to be choked off either and I think when this legislation passes, I'm hoping that someone in our area

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

applies for one of these licenses, and I hope that the elected body that accepts to try for this license receives it. I don't care which side of the river it goes on, cause they're both in my district. But if this becomes the the Illinois River definitely needs one to protect a tax paying...a tax paying county that is dropping lots of money into our revenue in the State of Illinois at the present time. And like they say, maybe we don't have to have gambling. It is a very successful operation at this time, but we don't want to reduce that operation by being outmaneuvered by other states or by just giving a license to the Mississippi River. If we are going to have gambling, I definitely think it's only fair and just that we give the Illinois River a license for the largest operation, probably in all three states outside of Louis is now in operation and doing very well. Let's keep it going well, and let's make it better. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of General Assembly. Senate Bill 572 is a community supported This Bill has bipartisan support in the community. The community has worked hard and long for passage of this I think each and every one of you are legislation. knowledgeable of this. Cassettes were provided, constant literature was provided to you, basically telling you what the shortcomings would be in my legislative district. Over 20,000 jobs have been lost in the last few years in that particular region. We are not changing the work force. We're trying to improve the work force. Give us an opportunity to be on the same playing field as our sister state, which is Iowa. Give us that opportunity. We can compete with the State of Iowa. We can do better than the State of Iowa. When you cast your vote on Senate Bill 572,

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

this is the question that you have to ask yourself, 'Will this benefit the community?' And surely, without question, your answer has to be yes, and for that reason and for economic growth in our particular legislative region...area, I ask you to please be supportive of Senate Bill 572. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "A couple of questions, Representative Giorgi. First of all, do you have a estimated initial beginning income that we might generate from this venture?"

Giorgi: "You're talking about an estimated income?"

Ropp: "The State. How much...into this educational fund...how much money might we expect to come forth?"

Giorgi: "I'll guess fifteen to twenty million dollars, but don't...I've just done my own mathematics without...The Economic and Fiscal Commission tried to scientifically put something together. They weren't able to, is that right?

And I just did my own arithmetic on the number of people I thought would be there on a sunny day and so on."

Ropp: "Okay, well, when the lottery was started a number of years ago, it took off somewhat slowly and then really dipped about the third or fourth year, then it has significantly come on, and this may occur, I would think. I...Another question relative to the 20 percent that will actually be taken off of the adjusted gross receipts, is it true then that a fourth of that is what actually goes to operate the Gaming Board? Twenty-five percent of that 20 percent?"

Giorgi: "You could've prefaced that question with, 'To the father of the lottery.' You didn't even mention that once.

Give me the question again, will you? Give me the question again, Gordy."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Ropp: "Oh, Okay. Well, I was going to lead that...lead up to that. The question is, to the father of the lottery, which started back in 1975."

Giorgi: "'73."

Ropp: "'73. Of the 20 percent that comes off of the adjusted gross..."

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir..."

- Ropp: "...Twenty-five percent of that goes to the Gaming Board for the operation of the program?"
- Giorgi: "No, no, no. Twenty-five percent of that goes to the local licensing dock. If their...the boat is docked in an unincorporated area, the county gets it. If it's in the city limits, the city gets it."
- Ropp: "Okay. Then 75 percent, then, goes into the Educational Fund?"
- Giorgi: "Except for what's needed for administration."
- Ropp: "Okay. Will that come forth by the appropriation process or will there be a percentage?"
- Giorgi: "Yes, Sir. It says specifically in the law. We will appropriate that."
- Ropp: "Okay. Alright. Then in the Educational Fund that we have already established, and I understand that if the temporary tax goes off, we would...we could in fact create a new...I mean just..."
- Giorgi: "You know we're going to face that. You know we're going to face that. Every red-blooded Member of the General Assembly will face that issue."
- Ropp: "Yes. Okay. So now in that fund we just put that money in. Do we have to assume that we will appropriate that through the normal process? If the money increases, will the money automatically go to schools in direct proportions? As we had intended, some thinking the lottery would add..."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Giorgi: "No. I...Let's clear up that myth for the hundredth time. When the Lottery Bill was passed in 1973, no funds were earmarked for education. In fact, RTA had a bigger grab on that money. Now, you're asking me if the Governor of the State of Illinois or the Bureau of the Budget is going to appropriate more money to education? That's their decision to make."

Ropp: "Okay, but let's say we're going along and we have appropriated \$12,000,000 into the Educational Fund from the riverboat gambling. And let's say we have a super good year and we get 20,000,000. Will that extra 8,000,000 go into the Educational Fund as a plus, or will it be taken out of the General Revenue Fund and spent on other state agencies as we have done the lottery?"

Giorgi: "I think that you've got to admit that the lottery has created more funds available to education. Last year's \$560,000,000, all of it went to education. You're talking about, is there going to be a super amount of money going into education? That's between the State Board of Education, the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor."

Ropp: "But, really it hasn't increased the amount that goes into education. What we have done is we've been able to increase the amount of money that goes into the General Revenue Fund so that we can spend it everywhere else, that we have capped the amount of money that goes into the educational fund because we appropriate it. It's not that as we get more money from the riverboat gambling, we're going to increase automatically across the board whatever the maximum is..."

Giorgi: "My good...to my good friend, John Matijevich, who is #2
 in the House says, if you repeal the lottery, you'd have
 \$560,000,000 less going into the Educational Fund."

Ropp: "Not...Well, not necessarily. Only if you wouldn't..."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Well, you wouldn't necessarily have less going into the Educational Fund because you could appropriate that amount of money, and just spend less money on programs that are in your district that you need."

Giorgi: "Right."

Ropp: "Which might be a good idea, huh? Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the To answer a few questions from across the aisle...We tried a bipartisan approach, tried to get input from the Republican side of the aisle in an effort to if this would work. And frankly, we didn't get the input that I expected we'd get as far as putting together a Bill that they...that you could support across the aisle and even experiment with one site or two sites. That effort was put forth by the Senator and myself, and we did not get that information. To answer a previous speaker, the lowest tax rate in the nation is Nevada. The most money going to education is Nevada, so that answers a question which was brought up by another speaker across the aisle. To the Quad City area...The last decade, the eighties, has been a very interesting decade for our area. We were, since 1930, pretty recession-proof. We had Cat, John Deere, Farmall. We had the ag. industry there that pretty much was stable for all those years. In 1980 everything collapsed. We've been struggling through the eighties, trying to diversify, get more jobs in the Quad Cities. Riverboat gambling? Is that the answer? No, that's not the answer, but it's a piece of the puzzle that can help us in a different area. Tourism. We have one of the greatest attractions in the world. People say, 'Where are you from?' and I say , 'I'm

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

from the Quad Cities.' 'Well, where's that?' 'Well, it's on the Mississippi River.' 'I know where that is.' Mississippi River is important to our area. It's a tourist attraction. Riverboat gambling is part of the history of that Mississippi River. Having two licenses of four boats on the Mississippi River would be a magnet for tourists to our area. I support wholeheartedly and as does the Chamber of Commerce, the mayors in the cities on both sides of the river in the Quad Cities. A good friend of mine. a Representative from Iowa, Tom Fay, introduced the Bill in the Iowa Legislature, and it took two years to pass there. Through tough times they passed the Bill and through the video that you received in the mail, you can see the development. The ninety...the hundred million dollars in development that is very, very possible and imminent in the Davenport area...and Bettendorf. So I ask you to support this riverboat Bill...gambling Bill because in our area, especially, it's going to be instrumental in helping us get the tourists and economic development that we need for the Quad Cities. Thank you."

- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Flinn. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "On behalf of Representative Flinn, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. The Chair recognizes Representative...Speaker Madigan to close."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the adoption of this Conference Report which would realize the operation of riverboat gambling along two rivers within the State of Illinois. My support for this Bill is in response to the

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

requests of several communities that this authorization be given for the purpose of economic development. I'm like many other people who have already spoken in debate. I'm overly anxious to support the authorization additional gambling. I would prefer that the State ٥f not move in the direction of more gambling. The truth of the matter is that over the last several years, we have authorized various forms of gambling, most notably the state lottery, which as all of you know, is a big element of the state budget today. So my support is given despite my reluctance to support more gambling. My support is given because several communities have told us that this would, in fact, help them in terms of the economic development of their areas. I've listened with great interest to the arguments against this Bill which have come from the Republican side of the chamber. I've listened with great interest, because I have followed this issue in the media over several months, and I recall reading in a Decatur newspaper on June 7th of last year where our Republican Governor was quoted as saying that, 'I've come the conclusion that this is something we should do for local communities. It's really critical for the northwest part of the state, the Quad City area, because otherwise they'll lose substantial tourism and economic development revenue to Iowa.' James R. Thompson, Republican Governor of Illinois. And then, I also read in the Moline newspaper on June 30th of 1989, we were very busy with the end of Session, but I had time to read this article where Mr. Thompson again stated that we must respond to Iowa's 'There's no question about that', said Mr. challenge. Thompson, the Republican Governor of Illinois. And then again in the Moline paper, October 19th of last year the Governor again was quoted as saying, 'I want to get

٢

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

passed and signed and get this moving.' And then very recently, again in Moline, November 5th of 1989, the Governor said he expects another attempt at passage of a gambling Bill January 10th when the General Assembly officially opens its Spring Session. Quote: 'I refuse to believe that the General Assembly will let Iowa qo and steal a march on Illinois.', Mr. Thompson told the Daily Dispatch. And I read all of this with great regret. I read it with regret, because Mr. Thompson has announced his retirement. And I was asked several times yesterday by the members of the media. did I think that Mr. Thompson would be a lame duck Governor, incapable of moving his initiatives through the General Assembly? And my response to the media was, 'no'. I didn't think he would be a lame duck Governor. I didn't think that he would be a passive Governor; I thought that he would be active. And I thought he would be successful, because he had enjoyed a good working relationship with the Illinois General Assembly. And in light of those comments yesterday, I listen with great regret to these arguments by the Members of his party against what the Governor views as an economic development initiative for areas of the state that need this authorization to put people to work, to earn a livelihood and to pay Illinois taxes so we can spend that tax money on education and other social service needs of this state. do listen with great regret to these comments of the Republicans and in light of that, I call the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives to respond, to respond to the areas of the state that have asked for this authority and to respond to our Republican Governor, Mr. Thompson, and to bail him out of predicament. When our poor Governor stands and says, 'Give us this authority.', and apparently he won't find any help

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

from his own Republicans. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 572?' This is final action and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Let me rise to say that in theory I, too, opposed to gambling. I've seen the false hopes that it instills in people and like any game, cards, dice, keno whatever, the odds are usually in the favor of the house, and the house is usually the biggest winner. Even if look at the lottery, the state is suppose to be the biggest winner and, of course, we've been told that most of the money goes to education. The reality of this Bill is that it's only an expansion of gambling in this state, so we're not starting anything new. There's bingo, horse racing, lottery and those are the legal games and, of course, we have the illegal games: poker, dice, bridge games that take place in many office buildings, homes and VFW halls. So gambling is nothing new. I'm concerned that with all forms of gambling, that affirmative action only takes place with minorities as participants. The bingo parlors are ran by the church in which very few, if any, Baptist churches run. The lottery, well, actually that idea was stolen from the minority...or taken from the minority community in which 'policy' was a game that was ran in the minority communities for a long time, considered illegal and then legalized when the state brought on the lottery. Horse racing, well, we all know racetracks and very minorities can work at them, but yet the game is here and

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

the participants...we as minorities still participate. would like to give an example of just how bad gambling can be. I am a small landlord. I've mentioned it to a few of you. And as of recent, I had a tenant who paid rent with a lottery ticket. She told me to come back a week later and then she presents to me a winning lottery ticket to pay her rent. I wonder that if she decides to go on a riverboat, where will I be able to cash in that riverboat chip, because only the riverboats will not be in the City of Chicago, at least not this year. So, I'm very concerned about what do I do with those chips, Mr. Sponsor? Of course, the good side of the Bill has been expressed. You've heard jobs, economic development and those other good buzz words. And now that we talk about economic developments for certain communities, we all feel that riverboat gambling is the answer. When Representative Younge has talked about economic development for the East St. Louis area before the riverboat idea came up, she could get very few votes. Now it's being sold to the Minority Legislators that it's good for East St. Louis, it's real economic development. Twenty-five percent of the proceeds is going to go to her area, your community is going to Well, there is a good side in that, and that is that the General Assembly has not dealt with true economic development. They have not shown a commitment to help distressed communities, and I think that maybe with this 25 percent and under the leadership of Representative Wyvetter Younge, maybe East St. Louis will be helped. Maybe this 25 percent of those proceeds can benefit that community. it's only because of Representative Younge's leadership and the commitment that I think that she's going to guide those monies to try to turn around what's happening in that community and because gambling is already in this state,

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

that I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I call upon the Democrats to support their Speaker.

Governor Thompson wants it one way; your Speaker wants it the other way. What's wrong with you guys who can't vote with your Speaker. Haven't you got any desire to play party politics hardball style? Support your Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if this appears to get those 60 votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, Representative Giorgi requests a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Balanoff. Shirley Jones."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones, S.: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of those not voting.

Levin and Ronan."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Balanoff? Record Representative Balanoff as voting 'aye'. Representative Levin."

Levin: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Laurino: "How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Levin: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative Mautino, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Mautino: "I rise to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Proceed."

Mautino: "Thank you. As a Member of the task force I raised some issues when we originally discussed this legislation. Some

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

of those concerns have been addressed with terminology as pertains to what is the definition of adjusted net revenues, so that the state would get a fair portion of this new proposal. And I thank Senator Jacobs as well as Bob DeJaegher and Joel Brunsvold for making adjustments so that expenses would not be deducted from gross income before this financial formula was enacted. don't particularly believe that this is the way to provide economic development, because there is no product that is produced by this legislation. I'd much rather see that philosophy for economic development have an end-line product, cause there's only so much disposable income available. I've also been informed that if, in fact, this legislation doesn't pass, we're back to a situation where certain individual Legislators are demanding additional funding for specific projects and some abatements. I don't want to see this Bill get any worse, and I have made a commitment and notification that I would not support this legislation as long as those provisions and the definition of what is adjusted gross profit and net profit were not clarified. They've been clarified. I will obstructionist to stand in the way of passing legislation, and I'm giving fair warning that the hundred and ten million dollar alternative that has been provided as really the impetus for this Bill and some of the rationale that there are...is not a bipartisan effort, I'll change my vote to 'yes' and apologize to the citizens I represent in my district."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Mautino wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 60 'aye', 54 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the Gentlemen, Mr. McCracken, requests a verification of the affirmative vote. Proceed, Representative

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Representative Curran?"

Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Clerk Balanoff. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaeqher. DeLeo. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Farlev. Flinn. Granberg. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Saltsman. Santiago. Shaw. Steczo. Sutker. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge

McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative Curran?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Curran is in the aisle on the right hand side of the podium."

McCracken: "Representative Balanoff?"

and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Balanoff. He's right in front of the well, speaking with Representative Bowman."

McCracken: "Oh, alright. Representative Edley?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Edley. He's in his chair."

McCracken: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Capparelli is in his chair."

McCracken: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hicks is coming down the aisle."

McCracken: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Novak. He's the fellow with the tan right there."

McCracken: "Representative Hartke?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hartke. He's at his chair.

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

He's..."

McCracken: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Mulcahey."

McCracken: "I see him."

Speaker Laurino: "He's in the rear of the chamber by Representative Farley."

McCracken: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Lou Jones is right here in front of the well."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Laurino: "No further questions. This Bill having received 60 'aye' votes, 54 'nay' and 1 voting 'present', the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 572 and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giorgi, you wish to be recognized, Sir?"

Giorgi: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Giorgi, having voted on the prevailing side, wishes the vote to be reconsidered.

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I move that Motion lie on the Table."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves that Motion lie on the Table. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Motion lies on the Table.

Representative Bowman, for what reason do you rise, Sir?

House Resolution 1257, Representative Bowman. Page 5 on the Calendar. On your Motion."

Bowman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise for purposes of a Motion. I filed House Resolution 1257 yesterday, and I move to discharge the Executive Committee. I spoke with the Chairman, and it's okay with him."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Laurino: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. He wishes to discharge the Executive Committee, using Rule 79(e), to discharge the committee and place on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Wishes...He asks for leave of the House with the use of the Attendance Roll Call. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "To be recognized prior to your last statement."

Speaker Laurino: "Speak, Sir. Speak."

McCracken: "I rise in opposition to the Motion. This is going to be used in an attempt to take more funds out of the General Revenue Fund for the CTA. The reason the appointment has to be done immediately, and the reason that this has to be done immediately that, that is, the committee has to be bypassed is so that they can have this Report by which to respond and ask us for more money prior to June 30th of this year. I rise in opposition, demand a Roll Call vote on the Motion."

Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. You've heard Representative McCracken. This will require 60 votes. All those in favor of discharging the Executive Committee for further consi...for immediate consideration, please vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 62 'aye' votes, 48 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present'... The Motion is adopted. The Bill has been...The Resolution has been put on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. It was a discharge Motion, Representative McCracken. It was a discharge Motion, Representative McCracken. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution, please."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1257, offered by Representative Bowman."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Bowman on House Resolution 1257."

- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, there's an Amendment offered to 1257 to provide for June 30th recording date. I move adoption of the Amendment. All the Amendment does is provide for a reporting date. Mr. Speaker, I just move for adoption of Amendment providing for reporting date."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Bowman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1257. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. On the Resolution, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Resolution was drafted and introduced in response to a mass transit controversy in which...in which numerous stations were proposed to be closed by the CTA, numerous bus lines were cut back, service at different times of the day was cut back. There were proposed fare restructurings, all of which has come on the heels of the gas tax increase. Now many of us down here voted for additional funding for mass transportation, and those of us who did felt that it was inappropriate for the CTA to proceed immediately on the heels of that to cut service and raise fares. In response, the...I filed two Motions or two...I filed two Resolutions, one calling on the CTA for an audit, one calling for an audit of the RTA's administrative budget to see if savings couldn't be made in administration before cutting service and raising fares. In the meantime, the CTA has cut its administrative expenses by ten million dollars, and I think made a faith effort. So this Resolution, all this asks for is the Auditor General do an audit of RTA's administration and

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

for the CTA to hold up on any service cuts or fare increases pending the result of that audit. I added the date for reporting to June 30th so that everyone knows there's a time certain, and this doesn't drag out forever. So I now urge adoption of House Resolution 1257 to help relieve this mass transit crisis in Chicago area. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise in opposition to this House Resolution. We audited the RTA, the CTA, PACE and METRA awhile back, and we did it...we did an audit for them for about...I would ask a question of the Sponsor. Will...If you would take this out of the record, one of the...The reason I was in opposition to this is that we expended substantial dollars...The state expended substantial dollars in the past to audit the CTA and the RTA and METRA and everything, and what those institutions did was they quit having their own audit. And, in effect, the C...we were paying for local government audits. What we're going to do now, and these audits don't come cheap. How much will the audit of the central office cost?"

Bowman: "Representative Keane, this is not a complete financial audit of the whole system. This is an attempt to find savings in the administrative lines. And that's all it is. So this audit, basically, what we're looking for is recommendations from the auditors for savings that can be made so that service cuts can be avoided. That's all."

Keane: "So are you asking for a performance audit?"

Bowman: "Well, you're the expert."

Keane: "The reason I ask is that the performance audit is much more expensive than a compliance or a financial audit."

Bowman: "Well, you know, I think a financial audit would be sufficient here, because basically what we're doing is

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

looking for suggestions for savings."

- Keane: "Why don't we ask the Attor...Auditor General then to review the financial audit of the RTA. It's been done by, I'm sure, one of the big eight accounting firms and then go from there. The reason is I don't..."
- Bowman: "If he chooses to do it that way, then that's fine with me. That would be his choice."
- Keane: "Well, let me ask maybe the co-chairman of the Audit Commission, Representative Leverenz, could get on this, but it is possible for the Audit Commission to put together in the commission meeting such a Resolution. I would rather...I would prefer to see it worked out with the Auditor General...with the Auditor General, you and the Chairman of the Committee...or the Commission."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Keane, we're getting into a dialogue here. Would you kindly bring your remarks to a close."
- Keane: "The purpose of this building is for dialogue, Mr. Speaker. Yes."
- Bowman: "Well. Representative Keane, the purpose for this Resolution... This Resolution has two purposes. One is it calls on the CTA to suspend action towards making service cuts or raising fares while this audit is in progress. And I think that's important, because many of us here in the Assembly voted for additional support, mostly on capital side, but additional support, and there's a gas tax increase there. And I think it's important that we send a message from the whole House to the CTA saying that these service cuts should be suspended until such time as we have more information about where other savings can be made. And that is the purpose for doing this. As I indicated, this is not to be a... The purpose for the audit is to suggest savings, so if the Auditor General can do it

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

very expeditious way, low-cost way, that's fine with me."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz, do you want to respond?

Representative Keane?"

Keane: "Just to finish. I would urge my colleagues to vote against this. We can do the thing in the Audit Commission.

I'd like to have the input of the Auditor General before we pass this, simply so that we don't get into another situation where we've a large expense of state, unnecessary large expense of state monies."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Klemm, the Gentleman from McHenry."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that Representative Bowman has maybe the wrong approach. Instead of auditing the RTA, which actually is the umbrella agency that funnels down, maybe we should be auditing the dollars operations of the CTA to find savings. That's where the millions and billions of dollars are actually accumulating, as METRA, as PACE would be. Now if you find the agencies that provide the service can't find the dollars because of inefficient operations, that's who we should be auditing, When we looked at METRA and the trains, we said, 'Alright the RTA is the umbrella for that agency, but let's see what METRA does.' I think Representative Keane is absolutely correct. We've had audits of all these agencies. Representative Bowman says that the CTA wants to shut down their own line, maybe we can find dollars within the CTA to find the dollars to keep those lines going. So oppose the concept of auditing the CTA to find dollars to do their job, but to audit another agency to find out if their administrative expenses to find out a few dollars out of operations is attacking the wrong group. We should be auditing the CTA if you want to. And that's the reason, I think, we're running on the wrong Amendment here, and I

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

think we should oppose auditing the RTA."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of House Resolution 1257. The CTA come...came to my neighborhood and held hearings on the closing of EL stations, on the closing or stopping of routes for a number of buses, the cutting down of service that buses will operate, the cutting down of time and increasing the length of time in between buses. And that is following right on the heels of a tax increase that we passed to provide additional funds for trans...for public transportation in that area. I think Representative Bowman is absolutely correct that the way to approach this problem to see if indeed there is other means available to pay for the needed funding of proper service to the people in Chicago and in Cook County to use public transportation, that we ought to conduct that audit, to see if there are administrative costs that could save that kind of money. The simple fact is that when you cut the availability of public transportation, that does not save you money. cuts down on ridership, which in turn costs you more revenue losses. It does not increase savings. It causes more revenue losses. We need some to get a handle on what's going on at the CTA, and by passing House Resolution 1257, that's one way to do it. I urge you to support Representative Bowman's Resolution."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In rising to support as well this Resolution, I would remind everybody that when we voted on the gas tax, one of the promises that was made to us, and I can tell you that for me, the gas tax was a very, very difficult vote. And what ended up tipping the balance with me and why I

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

ended up voting for it is because of the expressed commitments made to me by senior board members and staff of the RTA and CTA. That if we passed the gas tax, we would not have a fare increase or service cuts. The only thing we have down here is our word, and if we're told that by casting our vote, it will protect our constituents, that a particular action will not be taken, and they're now turning around and threatening to take that very action, want to know, why? The CTA has made ten million dollars in cuts in its bureaucracy. You know, we've looked at the Chicago Board of Education. We've focused on bureaucracy. We forced them to make cuts. We need to find out why it is that the transportation system in the northern part of this state, after having gotten significant infusion of new money, after having made a commitment to us of no increases in fares, no service cuts, has now changed the situation on us. This Resolution, I think, is the way to go. It sends the message that people are fed up, that if we're paying higher gas tax, shouldn't be paying higher rates and we shouldn't be seeing service cuts. When they come down here, and they lobby and they make a commitment to the Members of this Body, they better keep that commitment. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bowman, you want to close?

Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a couple of questions of the Sponsor, if I might?"

Bowman: "Please."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "Woods, have you discussed this with the Auditor General? Any idea of what the cost is going to be?"

Bowman: "Well, Representative Leverenz, no, I have not asked the Auditor General, but what I'm looking for here is basically

79th Legislative Day

January 11. 1990

suggestions on how savings can be made, and so I would suspect that this could be done out of the normal Auditor General's budget."

Leverenz: "That's real tight, and every time we do an additional law, that we give them an additional amount of money. This asks, however, that the General Assembly implore the Legislative Audit Commission, by its direction, to expeditiously consider the financial crisis of the CTA and to order such investigation of the Regional Transportation Authority, so I would think that we could consider that. And I would just ask that you all vote 'aye'."

Bowman: "Thank you. Thank you. In closing, let me just say the operative word there is investigation. If the Auditor General wants to look at existing records that are...or other audits that have been done by private accounting firms, that's the Auditor General's privilege. language here certainly contemplates that, and I believe that, in view of the fact passed we а massive transportation Bill last year, this is no time for service cuts. We ought to look for other options, and this is one way of doing that and keeping faith of the public, whom we just got through taxing for transportation. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass the Resolution?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

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

I certainly...I think this is a good Resolution, and I believe that it's...it would help if the Audit Commission looked into the...how they are spending the funds and we have put an awful lot of money up there, and certainly somebody need to look at it and make sure that those funds are spent correctly."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "My switches were not working, but when you turned on my microphone, I automatically voted 'green', which is really what I wanted to do, but if there is someone that can fix that, I would like to be able to vote from back here rather than the Gentleman that controls my microphone.

Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "You really want to vote your own switch,

Representative Leverenz? Have all voted who wish?"

Leverenz: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Giglio: "I was wondering if you really wanted to vote
 your own switch?"

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "Oh, alright."

Leverenz: "My question to the Chair is, now?"

Speaker Giglio: "I think now is the appropriate time."

Leverenz: "Oh, we finally got there. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 68 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present' and the House does adopt House Resolution 1257.

Supplemental Calendar #4 appears Senate Bill 1402, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to accept the First Conference Committee Report. What it does to Senate Bill 1402, it increases the...liberalizes the circuit breaker from its basic 14,000 to 18,000 annual household income, for first to be effective in 1990. This revision will make additional oh, 46,000 households eligible at the cost of 27,000,000 per annum. Number two, it increases the income qualifications for the senior citizen property tax deferral program from 14,000 to 18,000, also perspective in 1990 an additional 46,000 household. The costs are very minimal

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

here. There are only 200 households ever asked for this. And third, permits counties, and only permits if they wish to, establish a system for a four-year property tax payment plan. I move to accept the First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Capparelli, I have not had the opportunity to read this Conference Committee Report in its entirety, but it is important for me and for my colleagues, I believe, to know. Is there in this Conference Committee Report any provision for the use of prior year EAV?"

Capparelli: "No."

Cowlishaw: "That is not contained in this Report."

Capparelli: "No, it is not."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative Capparelli, this second committee...the

First Conference Committee Report, is this identical to the

proposal that was presented to us in the latter part of the

Override Session?"

Capparelli: "No, it's not. No, it's not."

Mautino: "It's not. It does not affect the assessed valuation in those counties that have reduced assessed valuations because of economic..."

Capparelli: "That's in the next Bill coming up, Sir."

Mautino: "Okay, thank you."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Capparelli to close."

Capparelli: "I ask for an Affirmative Roll Call. Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1402?'

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

  The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm looking at the board, and I'd like to explain my vote. I wonder if the Members of the House realize that if we bring this up to 18,000, the...still the Pharmaceutical Act would only be down to 14,000. So if a person is in that income range, between 14,000 to 18,000, he will not or she will not be able to get pharmaceutical assistance. It's still in Subsection (f) at 14,000, so I wanted to point that out. And I'm going to change my vote to 'no'."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Just to again let you know that when you opened the board, the board automatically voted me 'aye'. I know there was a request by certain people that I return to the House chamber around 1:30. I got here at 20 to 2:00. I'm back, so you can pull the fuse on the automatic voting mechanism that has me under the Speaker's control at this point."

Leverenz: "Which way would you like it?"

Speaker Giglio: "Any which way you want. 'Present'."

Leverenz: "I'm pushing 'red'; it don't light. I'm pushing 'yellow'; it don't light."

Speaker Giglio: "Check your...Check that 'green' button. Is

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

there a paper clip in there or something?"

- Leverenz: "That went out about four years ago when the new board came in, Sir. We know how to put them on automatic pilot."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright, we're going to send the electrician over there. Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "We would request an immediate investigation as to the electronic problems that are causing automatic 'green' votes on Democrat Bills."
- Leverenz: "I think it's real interesting. We could have gotten the debate over on the riverboat thing a lot earlier if this was the case, which is already on the Governor's desk."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Yes, I would like more clarification on the point in reference that Representative Wojcik brought up, because if I look at 1402, line 19 and 20, it says that it does affect Section 1 of the Senior Citizen and Disabled Persons Property Tax and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. And I just need clarification. Is that still her position?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative, we're really on the explanation of votes. If you want to explain that position, you know, vote accordingly. That's your prerogative."

Wojcik: "Turn me off."

- Parke: "Well, it would be helpful to some of us if the Sponsor could make reference to this."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1402 and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 853, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Assembly. Senate Bill 853 increases the homestead exemption from 3,500, a reduction of equalized assessed valuation to \$4,500, first effective for 1989 assessments and 1990 tax bills. As all of us know in the Assembly, the Homestead Exemption Act was instituted in 1977 at \$1,500. and in 1979 it went to \$3,000, and in 1983 it went to 3.500. And now we are asking to qive relief approximately 1.5 million households downstate, 1,000,000 households in Cook County, which would be a small savings but an effective savings to these households that are bearing the burden of additional property tax at this time. We believe that there's some opposition that's forth from it, has been really proposed in fiction. think we have to go with the trust that we had in 1977. instituted the Act. We must continue down in that road, and then we can probably take a better reading in the years to come. I would ask the support of all those in the and especially, those that are representing Assembly, families, households, that have had this extra burden of tax in their property tax that's placed upon them. need some help. They must receive some message from us that we are with them, and that we are trying to look for accountability in government. We are trying to do the best we can and still provide the services to these households, to state and local governments. We need...they need their help, we need your help today. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote and answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

McGann: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, as a very strong, consistent supporter of education, community colleges, elementary and secondary, and higher ed., how can you in good conscience attempt to

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

give property tax relief in this magnitude when, in fact, not more than six months, ten days ago, we passed a temporary income tax to provide funds for educating our young people. And now with this very proposal, you're attempting to at least reduce those funds that have gone to education now by as much as, at least 30 percent and maybe even more. Why would you want to do that now?"

McGann: "Thank you, Representative. First of all, I...the latter part of your question is what the fiction I was talking about, because there's no one that can bear out true percentages at this time. As far as my dedication to education, community colleges and universities, it still has the same energy as it had all throughout my lifetime. I think what we're trying to do here, though, is try to muddle the waters that we can in one area. We did help education; we'll continue to help education. And if the Governor signs the gam...riverboat gambling Bill, which he has stated in different publications according to the Speaker of this House, in recent months, that, that will help offset any loss in educational funds by the increase in the homestead exemption. We don't know. There may be very small figures involved, and I'd be one of the first if it has a great detriment to education to repeal, if it's possibly signed into law, to repeal апу additional exemption as we go down the road."

Ropp: "Well, thank you very much, but if you really look at the figures, we have, in fact, provided funds for education something like 300,000,000. With this proposal you're going to reduce all the way from, whatever you say, 170,000,000 to maybe 200,000,000, based on whose ever figures you want to look at. And it just seems to me that it shows that, once again unfortunately, the Legislature has not given any kind of long term wisdom towards

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

adequately reducing property tax so that it's fair and just across the board. When, in fact, we have knee jerked here once again and attempted to respond to a few people who say that their property taxes are high. Which is true, I don't think anyone is questioning that. The problem that we have with this is that we have, in fact, hoped to really place education as our number one priority, and right now we've cut the legs right out from under it, and this will be one of the saddest votes if this passes that we have had in this Legislative Session. It's too bad, we can't have it both ways. If we want to do something for education, then we did it well last June. To turn right around now do...reduce to erode the tax base that we have provided for is just not fair to the kids of the State of Illinois. ought to know better. We need to sit and constructively work on a replacement, possibly from income tax, to replace these dollars that you're going to away now if, in fact, we have high priority for placing education at the top of our list. We cannot continue to allow dropouts to expand to our prison population to grow and grow and grow, without adequately getting to the root of the whole situation. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not a good vote. We need to provide those dollars for education and not erode by doing a quickfix property tax relief in this fashion."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the idea of a homestead tax exemption is one that has a great deal of appeal if you don't really understand what the ultimate effect will be. The effect of this very small amount of tax relief to homeowners will really be a mirage, because in many cases home rule units of government can re-impose

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

this much or more by simply raising their tax rate. other cases part of the loss can be recaptured again by increasing the rate. The impact, as has just been said. will be very difficult for our educational programs to absorb. In fact, when this exemption is fully implemented, there will be a loss of more than five and a half dollars to our community college systems, and there will also be very large amounts of money lost to our local school systems. These are the bodies that cannot impose higher rates across the board. They can only impose them under certain circumstances, and the big losers will be in education. However, there will also be a loss to our other local governments that do not have home rule authority and cannot recoup their losses. The Park Districts. the Forest Preserve Districts. Districts. The problem is much too big to try to with this kind of a band-aid solution. Yes, we need to do something to give a larger responsibility to the income tax and a lesser responsibility to property tax for our funding for education. But we should not be doing that in a way that simply looks like a tax benefit, which will disappear the next time the taxing bodies can adjust their tax rates. If we are really going to give our educational program some stability, they cannot suffer this kind of loss immediately after having been given some additional funds on They have to have some consistency. temporary basis. Until we are able to design a longer range solution that combines property tax relief with a new source of income to be available for our schools, we should not be tinkering with the current system. It will have different effects on different parts of the state. When the Cook County homeowner has a 16 percent of market value as their assessed valuation, it becomes equal to a \$2,000 exemption

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

compared to downstate homeowners who are for them as assessed at 33 percent. If we are unhappy with the cost of local government, if, in fact, the increase in assessed valuation is providing funds beyond the needs of our local governments, we should be addressing that problem with our local officials. We should be monitoring what's happening in our counties and municipalities and park districts and all of those other local taxing bodies, each of which have responsible elected officials who control those budgets. And so if there is any area of the state where this increase in assessment really gives a windfall that a local government does not need, then let's resolve that at local level. But it is not appropriate that we take this route to take a meat axe approach, giving everybody penalty for having to deal with this decrease in assessed valuation, when, in fact, most of the districts don't deserve that kind of treatment. It is, in fact, a big impact on our educational programs, will...undermine in my view what we have attempted to do to get our schools to reform their practices and upgrade their performance. We cannot expect them to continue to do as we ask without a stable funding system. I urge you to reject this. not equitable from one part of the state to another, nor is it equitable for our taxing districts. Please use a local approach to be more responsible if your district is doing something it should not. This is not a solution; it simply provides another problem that we will have to address if this Bill should pass. I urge 'no' votes on this issue." Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The prior speaker has set forth most of the arguments that I think we have against this, Representative McGann. But I

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

would just say to you, and you do this so effectively and many times we want to do what you said, help us with this And we're saying back to you, help us, because what you want to do to solve your problem, and you have a problem, is going to make a very serious problem for us. And so I have to come back and say, Representative McGann, we don't want to help...we want to help, but we are asking you to help us and not create a problem for us at this time. It is obvious, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that we have a problem with our property tax system. problem with the way we fund education. We have a problem with our school aid formula. Let's be above politics. Let's be above the area of this state we come from and sit down this spring and work out a solution to the property tax problems in this state, equitable funding mechanism and an equitable formula. will help you do that, Representative McGann, but don't do that to us today and take away the money, the little amount of money that we're going to get from our schools...for our schools from the temporary income tax. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's been a great deal of misconception about what this Bill does and what it doesn't do. It does not in any way take money away from the present funding of elementary, secondary schools or any other unit of local government. Let me repeat it. It does not take away, this Bill does not take away any money that the schools in your district presently have. A homestead exemption, this is applied only to the growth. And for my Republican colleagues and friends from the northwest side who are going through, in Cook County who are going through a reassessment, you're going to get about a 30 percent kick in the assess increases...assessed valuation increases, and

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

I've been reading where school districts are asking for up to 44 percent increases in their levy on the north...in the northwest quadrant of Cook County, There are going to be massive...massive screaming and moaning complaining. And what this Bill would do, it would give extra \$1,000 exemption that would apply increase - to the increase and not to the base. The downstate...many areas of downstate are saying that they are going to get hurt. If you look at a map and you can get them from the Department of Revenue, a great deal of downstate has not reached the 3,500 level that they now have. In other words, in some parts of Illinois, value...this is all based on the value of the property in 1977. The value of the property has gone down. worth more in 1977 than it is today. Those never kicked The 3,500 that we now give homeowners exemption has never kicked in. Fortyfive hundred, we could make it 20,000 and it wouldn't make any difference, because until prices go up, it's not going to kick in. I... I think that this has an impact on any area where there's growth in assessment, where there's а tremendous, especially that's...I think all of you have read the papers and what some of the school districts and library districts are doing in...especially in the suburban part of Cook County. They're going...they're going crazy. The average...the average of one area, one township, the schools are up around 20 percent increase in levy. You add on the increase in the assessed valuation and the reassessment on the quadrennial and believe me, you're going to have shouts of pain. I would urge you to consider this well. It does not affect the base. It does not affect the base of the taxation that the schools are now enjoying. It only affects growth. Thank you."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been moved. Representative McGann to close. Representative...Excuse me, Representative Madigan. Excuse me, Rep...Speaker Madigan. Representative McGann."

McGann: "Speaker Madigan for the closing remarks."

Speaker Giglio: "Speaker Madigan for the closing remarks."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Mr. McGann. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Conference Report. Let me explain, first of all, what this Report does not contain. It does not contain an increase in the senior citizen's homestead exemption. The senior citizen's homestead exemption is an automatic decrease, an automatic loss in revenue for school districts and local governments. That is not in the Report. The Report does provide for an increase in the homestead exemption which only operates where there is an increase in the assessed valuation. Therefore. represent an area which is under the Farmland Assessment Law, there is little likelihood that this provision would operate in your area. If you represent some other area where there has not been an increase in the assessed this provision will not operate in your area. What this provision does is to say that in areas like Chicago, DuPage County, McHenry County, where there have been substantial increases in assessed valuation, resulting in substantial increases in real estate taxes, that there will be an increase in the general homestead exemption so that there will be some relief from the growth in real

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

estate taxes imposed on homes only. That is the essence of The opposition to this proposal comes from the proposal. local governments that will lose some growth. They will not suffer a net loss: they will suffer some loss in growth. It comes from school districts in the same situation. And obviously, there has been opposition raised by several school districts, including the Chicago Board of Education. And with regard to the Chicago Board of Education, I would like to offer to you some figures that dramatically show that this proposal is not as bad as has been advertised by certain of the opponents. So case of the Chicago Board of Education, and in terms of what is projected from the 1989 real estate tax collections to be used for the next budget of the Chicago Board of Education, begin with the understanding that the Chicago Board of Education will receive in real estate tax collections \$856,000,000. From real estate tax collections, \$856,000,000. That includes growth in real estate tax collections of \$38,000,000. If this Bill were to become law, for the Chicago Board of Education there would be a loss in growth of only \$13,000,000. So, I had talked in terms of growth of \$38,000,000, you subtract 13,000,000 from the 38,000,000, so if this were to become law, the growth for the Chicago Board of Education would be \$25,000,000, and the total amount of money to be spent in next budget from real estate taxes would be \$843,000,000. Please understand that all of this comes top of real estate tax growth for the Chicago Board of Education in 1987 of \$103,000,000 and real estate growth for the Chicago Board of Education in 1988 of \$100,000,000. So the growth under a worst case scenario for their next budget will be \$25,000,000, for the last budget the growth in real estate taxes was \$100,000,000

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

and the budget before that, \$103,000,000. I offer these statistics to show you that this proposal is not as bad as has been argued by certain of the opponents of the proposal. I think it's a good, sound idea. It simply says that if you own a home in an area where there has been substantial growth in the value of real estate, resulting in substantial growth in real estate taxes, you'll get a little bit of relief on your real estate taxes on your home. It's a good idea, not as bad as certain people who are shedding crocodile tears tell us it is. I think you ought to vote 'aye'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 853?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, the Minority Leader, Representative Daniels." Daniels: Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the risk of correcting the Speaker, some of the representations he makes are not completely accurate. For those areas downstate that have a small bit of growth, this exemption takes away that. So if you're concerned and if you're a downstate Legislator and you're concerned about a small growth that you may experience, this does affect that small growth and removes that opportunities from you on the tax bill. Now I think we need to have the facts as we look at this. This House passed out a Bill in November, Bill 1402, which was fairly sweeping in its reform as well as tax relief, containing relief upwards of \$555,000,000 in relief for Illinois citizens. That was changed to the current formula that you have right now in 1402, which recently passed, had the remains of a circuit breaker in there which was part of the first Bill that passed before, that contained other provisions. The difficulty that we're

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

facing right now, and the concerns that you need to have throughout the State of Illinois, is the Bill you have right now does...does literally nothing for taxpayers of Now if you must vote for this and you feel this state. it's important so that you can get through a primary by telling people you voted for tax relief, do as you must do, but understand that's what you're doing. But on the other hand, if you recognize the fact that taxpayers of Illinois are not going to be satisfied with 20 or 30 dollars and band-aid approach tax relief, then recognize that's what you're doing here. Another reason that you might not want to support this Bill at this time is that the Senate has Senator Rock refused to consider this portion adjourned. of the Bill because he opposes this type of phony tax relief. Now in the past, I have supported homestead exemption increases. The problem is far more complicated than what we're dealing with at this time. The issue is complex. It requires attention to school aid formula. Ιt requires a consensus, and it requires your very careful cooperation with Legislators from throughout this state. Those are the facts and ones that you might consider as you look at this important issue."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Regan. One minute to explain your vote."

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

Band—aid has been bandied about quite a bit but that certainly what this is. This isn't really reform.

However, it is a band—aid shoved in the gaping wounds of the taxpayer. It's something better than nothing, and I will support it. But one thing that must be done, it's been mentioned before, a total revamp of the revenue system, including education funding. That's what's needed this year before we get sued by a school district. That's

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

what's needed this year before we have Proposition 13 rammed down our throats, and then watch what the educators and the villages will do then when that happens. And that's coming if we don't do something about property tax relief. I urge you to support the Bill, but let's take a look in the future — early future — this year — what we can do about solving the whole problem."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Piel. One minute to explain your
   vote."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's too bad that the Sponsor decided he wanted to carry on with the Roll Call on this vote. He was approached a short time ago, and they told him that the vote is a moot point, and it's a situation to where the Senate, if you did not hear Representative Daniels a minute ago, the Senate has adjourned. This Bill will not be considered. I would ask all Members of the House to vote 'present', to say, hey, you know, I voted on the issue, but right now it is not something, as far as the Members of the House go, that is going to be a re-election Bill. are a lot of questions. You know, Representative Keane brought up some questions. There are questions on both sides of this issue that have got to be answered. And Representative McGann and Representative Madigan did not answer these questions, and so I would ask for a 'present' vote to show, hey, I was here, but it was...the point was not brought out, and the Senate had already adjourned, so the Bill shouldn't be voted on in the first place."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kubik. One minute to explain your vote."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to vote for this Bill, because I think that it is the only game in town. But...and I think you

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

ought to look at your district very, very carefully when you vote on this Bill. I happen to be from Cook County and for me, this...this particular Bill will probably be a pretty good piece of legislation. But I think the thing that bothers me most about this is that we aren't really addressing the total problem. It is not reform. It does nothing for the extension process. It does nothing for the assessment process. It does nothing about the multiplier. It does nothing about prior year EAV. No matter how you feel about those issues, this Bill does nothing to solve that problem. We will revisit this issue, if not this spring, next year or the year after, because in order to fund education properly, we've got to have a stable system of property tax in this state. This Bill doesn't do that. I'm sorry, but I'm going to vote 'aye' anyway."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris.
 One minute to explain your vote."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all recognize that the whole issue of education funding in this state should be looked at. But the Sponsors of this Bill and the Speaker of the think, accurately explained that this Bill impacts the growth in assessed valuation which occurs in certain districts. And let me tell you something, as a property taxpayer, as a homeowner in the northwest quadrant of Cook County is where I come from, I just had a reassessment bill 65...65 percent higher than what it was before. here to tell you that you cannot convince me that school districts and the units of local government in my area are going to be seriously hurt by this Bill when their entire valuation base on which they are operating is anywhere from 20 to 60 percent higher. There is a problem with this Bill. The problem is, it should be twice as

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

as what it is. Vote 'yes'."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson.

  One minute to explain your vote."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. think what Representative Harris and the Sponsor, Representative McGann, are probably pointing out is that we all come from Cook County. I, too, am going to support this Bill reluctantly, but we have some of the biggest problems in Cook County, probably because we have the goofiest system that exists. A true structural reform is needed and it was offered by Representative Daniels during the Veto Session. Hopefully, we will come back with more than just a temporary relief, very similar to what we did for schools with regards to the temporary income tax. Neither are the solution and both need to be addressed with a new school aid formula in a year from now, and let's work together on that."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stephens. One minute to explain
  your vote."
- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to listen to the various explanations of how you voted on this. We had a real tax reform Bill before us earlier in the year, and we voted on that, and that's your record on how you feel about property tax reform. That's the vote that counts because that was a live vote, that was a vote that still had a chance in the Senate. We know as we sit here today the Senate has gone home. You know that this vote is being put on the board purely for political gain. You want to send out your press releases. You want to attack people who vote one way or the other. It doesn't matter what you do on this vote, you're going to be attacked for political so they can knock a few of us off, or, you know, the Republicans make gains, the Democrats make gains. Who

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

really...this is wrong. You know it's wrong. You're wasting our time. It doesn't matter how you vote. Stand on your record. You proved it in the spring. Those of you who have been here for years, your record is clear. That's what you'll be judged on, because the voters in your district aren't dumb enough to believe the political crap that gets put out on behalf of one candidate or another. Your record will stand on the..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke.

One minute to explain your vote."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Stephens has pointed out rightfully that this is nothing more than a sham to try to fool the people in your legislative districts by voting for this. The Senate has adjourned. We probably will not address this issue until after we come back from the primaries, You're going to be able now to go out and tell your people that you have voted for property tax relief, when you know that this is not going to accomplish true property tax relief. It is...it should be an embarrassment to this chamber to put up a vote just for the sake of putting up a vote. This is not a meaningful property tax relief Bill. When we come back after the primary, we should work very diligently to give true, long-term property tax relief to the people in our legislative districts and to the people of this state. They deserve it. They..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich. One minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to explain my vote until

I hear all these people think we're crazy because we have
to look at what the Senate does. The fact of the matter
is, if we pass this Bill, we have done our job. The
Senate, whether you like it or not, is coming back in March

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

6th and 7th. They can do the job. Why do you want to hold back now? This is an attempt to try to get at inflationary assessed valuations, and I think that's good. But don't use the argument that we should go home just because the Senate went home. We've got a job to do, and we're doing it. Let them do their job March 6th and 7th, and then that's still before the primary, too."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 55 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no' and 16 voting 'present'. This Bill...the House fails to adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 853. Senate Bill 731, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold. Steczo. Representative Steczo, Senate Bill 731."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 731 is before us, and I would recommend adoption of the First Conference Committee Report. First, Conference Committee Report contains a number of local government items and...a few of which were passed by this House in January, but because that legislation failed to have an immediate effective date, needed to be restated, and they're restated in Senate Bill 731, those contained provisions relating to the Village of Volo clarification about city manager contracts and penalties for park districts and for terms of contracts incinerator facilities and for clarifications of downstate forest preserve districts be exempt from real estate taxes. All those provisions in House...Senate Bill 1161 passed the General Assembly in January without a dissenting vote, so those are noncontroversial. In addition to that, Amendments which had been included originally in...or items in Senate Bill 731 are also retained. There was

# 79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

noncontroversial language with regard to administrative hearings for building code violations in the City of Chicago and also for Amendments which deal with the relationship between municipalities entering into contracts with individuals or entities who are delinquent in the payment of property taxes. Mr. Speaker, also, there are a few new items that are placed in the context of Conference Report. all οf which I understand are noncontroversial. One affects Public Act 86-354 which became effective January 1st, 1990, which elevated the penalty for hunting on a person's property to a business offense which carries a penalty of two thousand to five thousand dollars. This restores that to a petty and that is something that I guess is desired by everybody and I understand is not controversial. It increases the Class A misdemeanor for violations of the Wildlife Code for certain offenses including using poisons, chemicals, explosions, crossbows, pistols, spotlights, etc, expressly authorized. Has provisions with relation to hunting between the hours of sunset and sunrise and for possessing freshly killed species protected by the Act out of season. In addition, it provides that nonresidents of Illinois will be awarded hunting privileges for fur-bearing mammals only to the extent that Illinois citizens are allowed to hunt such animals in the state οf the nonresident. And lastly, provide that hunting shall not be allowed within 100 yards of property operated under a migratory waterfowl hunting area. Currently the restriction is 300 yards of such property. That contains the provisions in this Conference Report. The Conference Report was approved by the Senate by a vote of 52 to nothing prior to their adjournment. As I indicated before, there seems to be agreement on all the items here, there's

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

no controversy, and I would appreciate adoption of the Report...First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 731."

Speaker Giglio: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As Members of the House may recall at one point in time there were several provisions in this Bill which dealt with prop...park district property tax levies statewide. Some of those were by referendum, some of those were without referendum. As one who had been interested in those provisions, I do want to state to the Membership here today, that all those provisions have been taken out of this Bill and so therefore as I perceive this Bill as a Member of the Conference that signed the Bill, it's a good Bill, there are no onerous positions...provisions herein anymore, and I urge it be adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Does this liberalize snipe hunting in any way?"

Steczo: "Representative Leverenz, no. No."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "I think you have cleared this up, but I just want to be sure. We had several calls in our office concerning a two thousand dollar fine if you trespass on somebody else's land even by mistake under the old law. Has that been removed?"

Steczo: "Mr. Ewing, the language has been changed. It restores

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

that to a petty offense as it was before."

Ewing: "Alright. The...there are a number of new offenses in this Bill, is that correct?"

Steczo: "No. No."

Ewing: "Dealing with hunting."

Steczo: "No new offenses."

Ewing: "Well, has the fine been raised or..."

Steczo: "There have been...there have been increases to a Class A misdemeanor for certain...certain violations that are contained in the Wildlife Code."

Ewing: "Okay."

Steczo: "Would you like me to list those for you?"

Ewing: "No. I know what they are, but I'm just trying to put this on record now. What...where was the recommendation for those increases in fines for those violations? Did they come from a committee, from a report, did somebody just think them up and think that we needed to raise the fine? Department of Conservation?"

Steczo: "My understanding, Representative Ewing, is that the Department of Conservation had input into raising the levels to the levels contained here in the Bill as well as discussions with the House Sponsor."

Ewing: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Rlemm: "Representative, on the developer donation Section that we have in here, last year the Bill that was passed and signed that I had introduced about developer donation, there was a Section in there that I thought we had agreed that we would leave in and that was the provision of public hearings, so that the developers and school people could discuss the merits or demerits, if you will, of developer donation.

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

And I see that that's been removed this time. It was my understanding that was going to be left in."

Steczo: "Representative Klemm, in response to your question think you'll recall that you and I together discussed the issue with the people involved, and the agreement that we came up with was to not require public hearings, but to allow the school boards to be able to notify municipality that they would request a public hearing. Unfortunately, we've...that language inadvertently was not included in, I believe House Bill 1994. So an effort was made this past...this past January to include language the which reflected agreement that everybody had. Unfortunately, we made some errors there as well, is the final version of what the agreement should have been last year."

Klemm: "Well, the law existing now is that a school board can always request right now to a municipality. There's no law preventing anybody from requesting. The problem tends be when the municipality does not wish to even entertain such a request. And so what we were doing and working in cooperation, we're saying that, 'Alright, at least let's have a public hearing if in fact the city does or municipality or the county does wish to do that, so we can get some public input.' When we talked to the developers and the group of gentlemen that you gave me to call and others in my district, they had said that a lot of times they have no idea, they really have no input on what schools are asking for. They'd like to at least have a chance to rebut perhaps the need for a developer donation on the amount. When I talk to my school people, they say, you know we like to have a public hearing so we can at least let the city officials know how we arrived at this figure, if it's fair and equitable, whether we need it or

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

to lower it.' And I thought that we were going to...at least it was my understanding last year though, that we needed some corrections, that we were going to leave that part of it. Maybe it's something we can work on this coming year. That's no problem. I don't want to delay anything, but I think it's something that's important for both sides to have a forum to solve this problem. In the northwest area, developer donation is a very important issue."

Steczo: "Representative Klemm, just in response to your question. I have sent this language and had it reviewed by school members, and they have no problem with this version of the However, I would also indicate in responding to lanquage. your statements, that right now if the municipalities concerned as to the amount of property, cash donation, land donation, on behalf of schools for a subdivision or property transfer or what have you, the school...or...the municipality right now is free to consult with the schools. In this legislation the schools are free to request a meeting of the municipality. One of the difficulties in mandating meetings, public hearings, because if we do it for schools we do it for everybody else. The whole practice then becomes very cumbersome and difficult to deal with on everybody's part. But, as a gesture to the schools who should have some input, we thought it important, you did, I did as well, that they at least be able to by law notify that municipality, notify the county and say, 'Yes, you are planning to expand, you're planning to annex, you're planning to build. It's going to have an impact on us. We in writing would like to meet with you and discuss how we can mutually come to an agreement so everybody can live happily every after.' That's what this does and it doesn't create any burden or harm for those local

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

governments or communities."

Klemm: "One other area of concern is that some municipalities are not forwarding the monies to the school districts, either in a timely manner or even in fact at all. And you see when an ordinance is adopted or a free annexation agreement is adopted, it goes to the city. The city is really the one who handles the dollars to the schools. Perhaps again, this coming Session or what is convenient, we can look at that area also. That would at least allow schools to receive the dollars they have, look for fairness and equity. I know this is the first start really we've had on developer donation, and I commend us both for working on it, cause it's been of concern to both of us. So, why don't we move on with this, let's see if we can look at these other areas of concern and perhaps resolve it if that's agreeable to you and I."

Steczo: "That's fine."

Klemm: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Shaw: "And would you explain to me Section 9 of this...of this

Act. What does that mean when you talk about

amend...prohibiting municipalities from entering into a

contract with individuals and so forth? What does...what

are we doing here?"

Steczo: "Representative Shaw, that Section which was originally House Bill 1185, and that provision on Senate Bill 731 is not new language that the Conference Committee adopted, that's language that passed this House in January nearly if not unanimously. It provides that municipalities...it prohibits them rather from entering into contracts with

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

individuals or entities that are delinquent in the payment of any tax. But, with regard to that prohibition there are exemptions and there's four; One, the parties, if they're currently contesting the liability for the tax, are exempt; if they've entered into an agreement with the Department of Revenue to pay the tax, they're exempt; if the goods or services provided by the party are vital to the public health, safety or welfare, they're exempt; and, if those providing goods or services with the municipality are unable to acquire a comparable price or quality, they're exempt. So, we're trying to...we're trying to forge something here which would be agreeable, but yet left exemptions which I think everybody can live with."

Shaw: "What I'm trying to find out now, the Department of Revenue, you mean the city or the State Department of Revenue?"

Steczo: "State Department of Revenue."

Shaw: "Alright. Now I'm providing goods and services, I have a business over here providing goods and services, does that mean my home if I'm the licensee in the...it's in my name as an individual, does that mean that I'd leave owing some taxes that the Department of Revenue come in and levy against my home?"

Steczo: "No. This simply says, Representative Shaw, that if you owe tax liabilities to the state that you cannot under...with the exception of the four conditions stated in this Bill, do business with municipalities if you owe tax liabilities unless you try to come up with an agreement to pay the tax liability to the state."

Shaw: "Okay."

Steczo: "So, we're not going to do people...business with people who are delinquent in their taxes. And it's under business not under personal assets."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Shaw: "Okay. One final question. In Section E, I'm not certain whether that's already current law, I doubt it. Any fine assessed by code enforcement officers may be vacated within 60 days if owner can show that the building has been brought up to compliance and...what it say...any...Section E... any fine assessed by code enforcement bureau may be vacated within 60 days if the owner can show that the building has been brought up to compliance."

Steczo: "Representative Shaw, I think that reflects partially current law. If you have a code violation and you go to court within 60 days and say I've corrected the violation, then the court...or the city could drop the fine."

Shaw: "Is this current law?"

Steczo: "It's partially current law. Yes."

Shaw: "I beg your pardon?"

Steczo: "It reflects current law."

Shaw: "Oh. Okay. Is this the City of Chicago's Bill here?"

Steczo: "Yes, it is. It's their Section, I should say."

Shaw: "I beg your pardon?"

Steczo: "It is their Section of the Bill. It's a Section of the Bill in which they are interested."

Shaw: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I presume the Sponsor will yield on a couple quick questions. One, does this increase the...anyone using a crossbow for taking of wildlife? Is there any increasing of that statute?"

Steczo: "Representative, if you could repeat that please. I couldn't hear you with the clamor in the chamber."

Parke: "Yes. Does this allow anyone in the State of Illinois to increase the use of crossbows?"

Steczo: "No, it does not."

Parke: "Second, it states in here that we're allowing fire

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

department people that are elected as union..."

Steczo: "That's no longer in the Bill."

Parke: "My synopsis shows it's in the Bill."

Steczo: "The Conference Report deletes everything after the enacting clause. That item, which was the original verbiage in the Bill, is not in the Bill."

Parke: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I would just ask for an 'affirmative'
 vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 731?' And on that question all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, you seeking recognition?"

Davis: "I wanted to explain my vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Davis: "I'm voting 'no' on this legislation, because first of all there's a lot of interesting things in this Conference Report. I think one of them being that if a building owner is found in violation, he no longer has to receive a registered or certified mail, but he could be sent a letter first class which means he may never receive it. You know, I think the legislation that was held previously that meant that if you were being charged with a violation of property that you did not reside on but that you owned, then you at least should have the courtesy of a registered letter or a certified letter, and I question why they want to remove concerned that stipulation. I also am about the administrators to be appointed by the City of Chicago. Rather than having court hearings on property that's in violation, we're going to go back to the archaic days..."

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990 -

Speaker Giglio: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Davis: "I just think it's a very bad piece of legislation, and when they realize what they've voted for, they're going to be sorry. Thank you."

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

Woolard: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my vote. I'm voting 'yes' on this issue and I have a serious concern about paragraph 12. I feel that we addressed this issue in a very similar fashion a very short time ago. the sake of safety, we spread our goose hunting pits in southern Illinois, in fact throughout this state, from 100 yards separation to 200 hundred yards. And in fact what we're doing here is decreasing the limitation that you have to...you would be required to seek the permission of a residence that was within a hundred yards of your pit. in fact what we're saying is, we should provide safety for our hunters, but we have little compassion for residents who live in the neighborhood. I think that we should effectively go back and look at this part of this Bill, but...in the sake of the best interests of the other portions of the Bill, I'm going to support it, but in fact we will be looking at this legislation again in the very near future."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question 100 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', and 8 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 731, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Countryman, House Bill 879. Representative Countryman."

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

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

House. The Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 879 does two things; One, it adds the word 'optometry' to...as the institutions that are eligible to receive grants according to the Health Services Educational Grants Act administered by the Board of Higher Education. It also now includes language which will provide for the terms of board members to be elected to the newly created Pontiac Community College District Board of Trustees, so that their terms may be staggered and they will draw those terms by lot after election. One of...of the initial members, two shall serve for one year, two for three years and three for five years. Their elected successors will serve six year terms thereafter. That was an oversight in some legislation in the spring and this will correct There's no fiscal impact to this Bill, as the Board of Higher Education presently awards optometry schools grants according to the Health Services Education Grants Act. that's all this does, except that it does clarify the original language in the underlying Bill which clarifies that all members appointed to the Board of Governors by the Governor shall serve six year terms. Be happy to answer any questions and move its adoption."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in...shall the...The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 879?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is Have all voted who wish? open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question 106 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' 1, none voting 'present', and the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 879. and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Agreed

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

Resolutions. Do the Adjournment Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 117.

'RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, January 11, 1990, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 7, 1990, at 11:00 o'clock a.m.; and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, January 11, 1990, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 17, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 24, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 31, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 7, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 14, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 21, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 28, 1990, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Thursday (sic - Tuesday), March 6, 1990, at 12:00 o'clock noon, and when it adjourns on that date, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 7, 1990, at 11:30 o'clock a.m., adopted by the Senate January 11th, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary.'"

Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to...the Members to take note that the dates that the Clerk read in were perfunct. We will actually be coming back at 12:00 o'clock noon on Tuesday, March the 6th. Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions. Representative McPike moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

79th Legislative Day

- January 11, 1990
- The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1279, offered by Representative McAuliffe; 1281, offered by Representative Capparelli; 1282, offered by Representative Homer; 1283, offered by Representative Bowman; 1284, offered by Representatives Deuchler and Cowlishaw; 1285, offered by Representative McPike; 1286, offered by Representative Daniels; 1287, offered by Representative Pullen; and, 1288, offered by Representative Ronan and Farley; and, House Joint Resolution 85, offered by Representative McCracken."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1280, offered by Representative Pullen et al., in respect to the memory of George Scharringhausen, Jr.; and, House Resolution 1289, offered by Representative LeFlore, in respect to the memory of Isabel Gambel."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves that the Death Resolutions be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Allowing the Clerk...allowing the Clerk five minutes for perfunct for the introduction of Bills, Representative McPike now moves that the House stands adjourned until 12:00 noon, March the 6th. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. The House now stands adjourned allowing perfunct time for the Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Introductions and First Readings. House Bill 2924,

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

offered by Representative Terzich, a Bill for An Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. First Reading of the House Bill 2925, offered by Representative Terzich, a Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code and the State Mandates Act. Second...First Reading of House Bill 2926, offered by Representative the Bill. Regan, et al., a Bill for An Act to amend the River Conservancy Districts Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2927, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for An Act in relationship to property taxes and general homestead exemptions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2928, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge, et al., a Bill for An Act to repeal the Southwestern Illinois Development Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2929, offered by Representative Terzich, a Bill for An Act to amend the Fireworks Regulation Act. Reading οf the Bill. House Bill 2930, offered by Representative McNamara, a Bill for An Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2931, offered by Representative Bernard Pedersen, et al., a Bill for An Act in relationship to Real Property Taxation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2932, offered by Representative Breslin, et al., a Bill for An Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First οf the Bill. House Bill 2933, offered by Representative Mautino, et al., a Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2934, offered by Representative Levin and Balanoff, a Bill for An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendments. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15, offered by Representatives Dunn and Olson.

79th Legislative Day

January 11, 1990

'RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 8 and 13 of Article I of the Constitution to read as follows:

#### ARTICLE I

#### BILL OF RIGHTS

#### SECTION 8. RIGHTS AFTER INDICTMENT

In criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the right to appear and defend in person and by counsel; and to demand the nature and cause of the accusation and have a copy thereof; to meet the witnesses face to face and to have process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf; and to have a speedy public trial by an impartial jury of the county in which the offense is alleged to have been committed, except that the General Assembly by law may abolish the right of jury trial for prosecutions of offenses which by law are punishable only by a fine of no more than \$500.

## SECTION 13. TRIAL BY JURY

The right of trial by jury as heretofore enjoyed shall remain inviolate, except that the General Assembly by law may abolish the right of jury trial for prosecutions of offenses which by law are punishable only by a fine of no more than \$500.

#### SCHEDULE

This amendment of Sections 8 and 13 of Article I of the Constitution takes effect on January 1 following its approval by the electors of this State.' First Reading of this Constitutional Amendment."

REPORT: TIFLDAY

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1 05/04/90

JANUARY 11, 1990

	PANUARY II. 1990		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-0745		PAGE	16
HB-0879		PAGE	98
HB-1211		PAGE	70
HB-1211		PAGE	23
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
		PAGE	18
HB-2431			
	FIRST READING	PAGE	11
	FIRST READING	PAGE	11
	FIRST READING	PAGE	11
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2917	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2918	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2919	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2920	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2921	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
HB-2922	FIRST READING	PAGE	13
HB-2923	FIRST READING	PAGE	13
HB-2924	FIRST READING	PAGE	101
HB-2925	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
HB-2926	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
HB-2927	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
HB-2931	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
\$8-0525		PAGE	19
SB-0572		PAGE	25-60
SB-0731		PAGE	88
\$8-0853		PAGE	72
SB-0971		PAGE	22
SB-1096		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-1402		PAGE	69
	RECALLED	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
HR-1257		PAGE	60
	FIRST READING	PAGE	102
SJR-0117		PAGE	100
20V-0111	AUGF IED	PAGE	100

#### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - REV. JAMES WOODS OF DECATUR	PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE ROPP	PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1	
INTRODUCTION OF SENECA IRISH CROSS COUNTRY TEAM	PAGE	2	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	5	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	5	
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	6	
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	6	
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	8	

REPORT: TIFLDAY

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2 05/04/90

JANUARY 11, 1990

# SUBJECT MATTER

REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	13	
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	15	
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	16	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	101	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	101	
ADJOURNMENT TO PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	101	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	101	