65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of one o'clock having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desks and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer this afternoon by Reverend Ivan Johnson, Presiding Elder, South District of Illinois Conference A.M.E Churches, Springfield, Illinois. Reverend.

THE REVEREND IVAN JOHNSON:

(Prayer by the Reverend Ivan Johnson)

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

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

Senate Journal of Thursday, June 27, 1991.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

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

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

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

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Friday, June 28th; Saturday, June 29th; Sunday, June 30th; Monday, July 1st; Tuesday, July 2nd; Wednesday, July 3rd; Thursday, July 4th; Friday, July 5th; Saturday, July 6th; Sunday, July 7th; Monday, July 8th; and Tuesday, July 9th, in the year 1991, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals. And in the words of Alan Dixon, "For that, I weep."

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Jacobs. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. And it is so ordered. Resolutions.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 83 offered by Senator Berman, President Rock and all Members.

It is congratulatory.

## PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 672 offered by Senator Daley.

It is congratulatory.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 84 offered by Senator Philip.

It is also congratulatory.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Joint Resolution 85 offered by Senator Philip and Thomas Dunn.

It is substantive.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Executive.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 673 offered by Senator Smith, President Rock and all Members.

It is congratulatory.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. Senator Topinka, for what purpose do you

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

arise?

## SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, a point of personal privilege, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Today, you have probably found bakery products on your desk, including some Italian ice and also a box lunch. And I want you to know that, first of all, the -this comes -- with everything but the box lunch, from my district which is very concerned that we have been down here too long. And representing a very ethnic district as I do where food is love this is a care package to make sure that we keep up our strength to solve the budget problem. And to that end, we owe our thanks to the Fingerhut Bakeries of Cicero for the kolacky which is the little fruit tart. And contrary to what Senator Brookins says, it is not a chinese fortune cookie. So if you break it in half, you will not get your fortune. All right. Second of all, the Italian ice comes to us from Mazzone's Italian Ice in Cicero from Bob Mazzone. The Suburban Cook County Area Agency on Aging and all the areas on aging are responsible for the box lunch, but they do want to make sure it is known that the Community Nutrition Network of Chicago, which is a suburban nutrition provider, put together and did pay for all the lunches. So it did not come at any taxpayers funds and this, too, is to help us get through the crisis. So, thank you very much.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

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

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

On a point of personal privilege.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

To show the dedication and love that he has for the people of

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Illinois, Senator George Ray Hudson celebrated his 49th Wedding Anniversary with us here yesterday, instead of being home.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Happy anniversary, Senator.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Congratulate him.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schaffer, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Just to congratulate Senator Hudson and his wife and to express the hope we won't be here to celebrate his 50th.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Hudson, in your own defense.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Senator Schaffer stole my -- some of my comments. I was just going to suggest that if we are still in Session -- in this Session next year - next year is the biggie; that's the 50th - and if we're still in Session at that time, we will celebrate down here and you're all invited.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise, sir?
SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. There will be a Democratic Caucus immediately in Room 212.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Democratic Caucus immediately in 212. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, there will be a Republican Caucus immediately in Senator James Pate Philip's Office accordingly.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

All right. Republican Caucus immediately in Senator Philip's Office. Democratic Caucus immediately in Room 212. The Senate will stand in recess. Given the fact that Leadership has a thee o'clock meeting with the Governor, we will stand in recess till the hour of four o'clock. A Democratic Caucus immediately in Room 212. I'm sorry, Senator Philip.

#### SENATOR PHILIP:

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

I'd like the record to indicate that Senator Keats is home from
the hospital and doing well, but in a little bit of pain.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The record will so reflect. All right. Republican Caucus immediately in Senator Philip's Office. Democratic Caucus immediately in 212, please. All Democrats to 212.

(RECESS)

#### (SENATE RECONVENES)

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senate will please come to order. Messages from the House, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

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

House Joint Resolution 48.

Adopted by the House, July 2, 1991. It is substantive. PRESIDENT ROCK:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Executive.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to recede from their amendments -- Amendment No. 1 to a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 302.

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

Action take by the House, July 9, 1991.

And I have like Messages on -- with regard to:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 303;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 304;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 306;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 310;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 311;

House Amendments. 1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 334;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 336;

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 337;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 338;

House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 339;

House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 3-4-0;

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3-4-1;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3-4-4;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3-4-6;

House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 3-4-8;

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3-5-2;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3-5-4;

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3-5-6;

# 65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3-5-7;

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 3-5-8;

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 3-6-0;

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3-6-1;

House Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 3-6-6;

House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 3-6-7;

House Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 3-6-9;

House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 3-7-1;

House Amendments 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to Senate Bill 3-7-2;

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3-7-3;

House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 3-7-4;

And House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 4-9-7.

Action taken by the House, July 9, 1991.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Those are requests from the House for a conference committee?

All right. Senator Carroll will move that the Senate accede to the request of the House for a conference committee. Resolutions.

Or Messages from the House.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 37 and requests a Second Committee of Conference to consider the differences between the two Houses in regards to Amendments 1, 2 and 3.

Action taken by the House, July 10, 1991, by a three-fifths vote. PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Dunn will move that the Senate accede to the request of the House for a Second Conference Committee. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. It's so ordered. Resolutions.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Senate Resolution 674 offered by Senator Lechowicz.

Senate Resolution 676 offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

Senate Resolution 677 offered by Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 678 offered by Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 679 offered by Senator Mahar.

And Senate Joint Resolution 86 offered by Senator Watson.

They're all congratulatory and death resolutions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Resolution 675 offered by Senator Topinka.

It is substantive.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka, is that the one you're talking about? SENATOR TOPINKA:

It is.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, if I may have permission of the Senate, Mr. President, I would like to discharge the Executive Committee of any further responsibility of Senate Resolution 675 and have it put on the Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. And I have permission from Senators Marovitz and Donahue to do so.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Resolution 6-7-5 and asks that it be placed on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. All in favor of that motion, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. 675 will show on the Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll begin again on Page 11 on the Order of

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Conference Committee Reports. If any Member has a Conference Committee Report on Page 11. Page 12. All right. Middle of Page 12. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports is a report on House Bill 1970, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Corrected Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1970.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jones.

#### SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate concur in -- I mean, adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1970. What it is is retained the bill which -- allowed for interior design qualification exam to be given by the National Board. It required two years, instead of one year, experience for registration. Required an applicant to complete the registration and restoration process within three years. And what was added in the conference committee was that it added an immediate effective date and also clarified the sixty-day period for a temporary license to be extended until the next Board meeting, if there is no action by the Board. And I move that we adopt the Conference Committee Report.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Jones has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1970. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1970. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 Ayes, 5 Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1970, and the bill, having received

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Any other Member on Page 12? Page 13? Senator Cullerton. Number is? I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

446, on Page 12.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Okay. Bottom of Page 12, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports is a report with respect to Senate Bill 4-4-6. Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 4-4-6.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This Conference Committee Report is basically now just one relatively small change in the law -- criminal law, with regard to expungements. It applies to all counties other than Cook, and it simply says that the trial judge may grant an expungement. Right now the current law is to say that the -- only the chief judge or a judge designated by the chief judge may grant expungements. This was primarily requested by Representative Johnson who put it on as an amendment over in the House. Some people in Cook County objected to it based on the fact that there's so much volume in Cook County. The wanted to keep a better record of it by having it with the chief of the criminal division. So they objected. So the bill simply says that in counties outside of Cook, the trial judge, as well as the chief judge, may grant an expungement.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Senator Welch.

# SENATOR WELCH:

-- the sponsor. Senator Cullerton, in some of our laws, if

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

you -- if you have a conviction, you cannot do certain things; either get a job with the State or have a firearm. Is there anything in here that's a guideline for a judge when not to expunge a conviction?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

No, it doesn't change any of the current law with regard to how expungements are granted other than to just change the person that can actually grant it, and that is the trial judge as -- so it's simply procedural.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Dunn.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he'll yield, Senator Dunn.

## SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator Cullerton, is there still notification to the police organizations, the arresting police body, on the expungement? Is that unchanged.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

That part is not changed by this bill.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 4-4-6. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 Ayes, 5 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate does adopt

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 446. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Any other Member on Page 13? Senator Luft? Page 12. 1838, Madam Secretary. Middle of Page 12. House Bill 1838. SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1838, the Conference Committee Report, deals with tax increment financing and is attempting to take care of about four or five Members in the Body. First, it limits the required ten percent municipal contribution from sources other than property taxes to actual amounts of revenues generated within the TIF district. Apparently, there's a city in northern Illinois that does not levy a property tax, and they required an alternative revenue source and this limits it strictly to the revenues coming from the TIF district. We also call for cities with a population of over a hundred thousand - it allows a TIF redevelopment plan to conform to a strategic economic redevelopment plan, rather than a city's comprehensive plan. Apparently, some cities do not have comprehensive plans, so we're allowing them to conform to the economic redevelopment plan. Also allows the cities to expand -- expand the boundaries of an established TIF district within an established redevelopment project area without hearings. For Senator Jacobs, we have put language in here that allowed that a municipality that adopted a TIF prior to 1987 provided that the adoption of an ordinance with the findings is sufficient to designate a redevelopment project if adopted within ninety days of the effective date of this Act. We repeal a property tax abatement for Eagle Creek, which was done in error. And we authorize a property tax abatement for

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

projects consisting of a restaurant and overnight lodging facility on Department of Conservation's property that was constructed using at least fifty percent private, non-State funding and that first opened for business after January 1 of 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838. Discussion? Senator Fawell. SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Luft, there has been another bill that as been floating around, Senate Bill 616, about TIF districts. Does this have any of the language in this conference bill that Senate Bill 616 did about the bonding?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

This has no language concerning bonding.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I also notice that you have something in here about the Eagle Ridge, you mentioned. Senator Keats obviously is not here, and I know there was some -- some problems with this. Has this -- is this now agreed language? I mean, is everybody on board with this thing, that you know of?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

It's my understanding that that situation has been resolved and everyone is in agreement with the language in this Conference Committee Report.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, Mr. President, I understand that the problem in the Moline case - that this was created without so much as a hearing or a notification. Can you comment on that?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Senator Jacobs, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. Senator. No, I'm -- that is not correct. I talked to the mayor, in fact, two days ago to try to find out what did happen. It was advertised properly. The only thing they didn't do was put in legal descriptions. They put in leaps and bounds, rather than legal descriptions and that was the problem with their publication.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Did they have a hearing?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It's my understanding they did.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question to the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Senator Luft, I'm sorry that we've had a conversation over here, and I didn't hear the explanation of the bill. Is the original contents of House Bill 1838 dealing with the TIF in Carol Stream still in the bill?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Yes.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I too didn't hear the entire explanation. I guess my question could best be phrased this way: Is the Tax Increment Financing Association on board with the changes in this bill?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

I'm fairly close to that organization, and this bill is floating around in one way or the other. This is a combination of about three or four different pieces of legislation that's passed through the Legislature. And as we speak, no one has ever offered any objections to any part of it that I know of.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This particular Conference Committee Report contains the language concerning Eagle Creek. And the other day we had quite a debate concerning that. This language now in here is agreed to by myself, the Department of Conservation. And I talked with Senator Keats concerning this, and he too is in agreement. So I rise in support of the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838 and urge the Members to vote in affirmative. Thank you.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Luft, do you wish to close? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 13, 872. Senator Lechowicz. Madam Secretary, middle of Page 13, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a report with respect to Senate Bill 872. Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 8-7-2. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Lechowicz.

# SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

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

Second Conference Committee Report on 872 allows Cook County to use unexpended highway bond funds for highway construction, reconstruction and maintenance purposes. Clarifies that

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

delinquent unpaid property taxes bear interest monthly interest rates on any portion thereof. Expands category of property owners eligible for a two-and-a-half year redemption period from current class of priorities which are owner-occupied and contain six or less units -- dwelling units -to property units -- containing six dwellings or units or less. Also provides that it creates a fifth and sixth penalty period to correspond with periods of time between twenty-four and thirty-six months from date of sale, which is or may be part of a redemption These are all items that were adopted by either -- by the Cook County Recorder of Deeds, Eddie Rosewell's office, as well as the Cook County Board. And a third item provides that a item be provided where the separate undivided interest in delinquent sale property. It adds to the fees to be paid by a person redeeming his or her property sold at a tax sale a thirty-five dollar fee payable to a tax purchaser if a tax deed has been filed, a four dollar fee if notice has been served, and all costs the tax purchaser incurs in filing. Basically, all the other items as far as -- that this Body has rejected before, as far as the Eagle tax Ridge benefits have been eliminated. I have no objection to the -- I know of no objection to -- 8-7-2 and ask for your adoption.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the -- Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 872. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 8-7-2. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question there are 31 Ayes, 18 Nays. Takes 36 votes. On that question, there are 31 Ayes, 18 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted. Senator Lechowicz

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

moves that further consideration be postponed. 1030. Senator Daley. Madam Secretary, please.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1030.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Daley.

#### SENATOR DALEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1030 would permit municipalities to apply for a court order to remove debris from buildings. The cost of the foreclosure of liens by a municipality, including court costs as a lien on the real estate, are recoverable by the municipality from the owner. It adds township members to watershed councils in Cook County for storm water. It would permit the transfer of fire protection district territory between districts in certain circumstances. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1030. Discussion? Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. The minority side has reviewed this bill, find nothing controversial about it, and I would suggest we vote Aye.

# PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1030. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. Senate does accept -- adopt the Conference Committee Report on

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Senate Bill 1030. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Barkhausen, you want to go back to dump the first report? Is that the idea? Page 12, Ladies and Gentlemen, right in the middle, is House Bill 2125. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2125.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President, I suggest that we vote Present on the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2125. I think it's a good Report, but the House has already voted it down. So we need to go to a Second Conference Committee.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2125. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 8, the Nays are 12, 26 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. And Senator Barkhausen requests the appointment of a Second Committee of Conference. Any other business on 11, 12, 13? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I've got a noncontroversial one, 1227.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

None of yours are noncontroversial.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Let's try it and see.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Mr. President, I think Senate Bill 1310 is noncontroversial. You can call that.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Chair doesn't think so.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

I beg your pardon?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Chair doesn't think so. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, any further business to come before the Senate? Senator Maitland, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Rising on -- for the purpose of making a motion, sir, to suspend the provisions of Senate Rule 5C with regard to deadline for passage, and move for the immediate consideration of House Bill 214, which resides on the Order of 2nd Reading. Would like to offer an amendment to that bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave of the Body to suspend the rules and move to Page 8 on the Calendar on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading for the purpose of offering an amendment to House Bill 214. Without objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, top of Page 8, is House Bill 214, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 214.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Senator Maitland offers Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Maitland, on Amendment No. 1.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The budgeteers and the summiteers are continuing to work through the disagreements that we have right now, and we are making, believe, progress, and hopefully, in a few days, we're going to be able to resolve this. But we are concerned about a number of State employees who, on the two-week schedule, are going to be approaching their payroll time. And therefore, Amendment No. 2 --Amendment No. 1 would appropriate approximately three hundred million dollars in all funds. Also included is some eight hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars for workers who are on work comp leaves right now - their disability payments, and 18.5 million to the Lottery, because obviously, the Lottery is -- is a revenue producer for us. We're going to need this money, and we believe -- to bridge this gap for a few days, we believe that this amendment is -- is necessary. I believe we are getting closer all the time. Therefore, Mr. President, I would move for adoption.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 214. Is there discussion? Senator Carroll.

# SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, June 30th we had suggested that there were some areas of government that should not be subject to this type of a crisis that we're now in. Why, I remember even in May we suggested that one of them — that a federal court had said since, should not be at crisis because we are in disagreement. We offered to fund it.

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Passed it. Governor vetoed it. June 30th no one Republican side of the aisle thought it necessary to fund the essential services of State Government and brought government to a halt - an absolute halt. We had tried, Senator Maitland, as you'll recall, as budgeteers and conferees, to meet - end of June, early July. Most often in June the meetings were postponed from not hour to hour, like happens around here all the time, but multi-day to multi-day. We're told to be here on a Thursday 3:00 to meet, then suddenly, no, let's do it Tuesday, and then how about next Friday, and how about next month. We met as conferees. asked questions - a week ago Saturday - and said we're all working. We assume the Bureau is. We assume the Directors who are still in town are working. Those who are not in town, we understand, may be not -- be working, whether they're in Harvard But at least those that are here can get us some or wherever. answers by three o'clock the next day. Six days later - six days later, some very simple questions still unanswered, maybe half the answers given. We are at an impasse because the Governor wants us to be at one, not because there's any real disagreement in the budget. I think everyone knows that we've tried to work in good though sometimes some people say they're not at liberty to discuss things. We've made presentations; we've made proposals that we believe can fund State Government, including grants, including those most in need - not merely those employed by the State, but those who depend upon the State or those to whom the State says, "Do this and we'll pay you." We've gotten it within a hundred million dollars of where the Governor thinks it ought be, though he keeps changing the number. We present a balanced budget, and he moves the figure. I said before, it's like playing baseball and from home plate to first base is sixty feet, and the ball and Edgar runs out there and grabs for his base and keeps running with it. We had a balanced budget with hundreds of

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

millions of dollars in the bank, and suddenly there's another shortfall. We cover almost all of that, and suddenly there's another shortfall. He said June 30th, "No piecemeal budget." He said this morning, "No piecemeal budget." I agree. No piecemeal budget. Vote No.

#### PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

## SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, ten days ago, I think most of us here thought that this impasse would be resolved, certainly by the 5th or 6th. I don't think any of us counted on this going on as long as it has. And despite, I would say, yeoman efforts by our appropriation people, particularly those in the Senate, to close the gap, it's still obvious to me that there are major issues; such as the surcharge, property tax caps, a bill our friends from Southern Illinois are interested in on coal, and some other major issues, that are still very much up in the air. I happen to agree, if reasonable people could get together, one would think that could be concluded quickly. Of course, I felt that way ten days ago. I see no reason why an employee of Department of Mental Health emptying bedpans in Lincoln should be denied their pay because we can't get our act together down here. It's my understanding - and, Senator Maitland, correct me if I'm wrong - that the culprits are not included in this bill. does not include the Members of the General Assembly, Governor, either for salary or expenses. But the innocent - those people that work in our hospitals and guard the prisoners and keep our highways safe - are included. That's what this roll call all about. Why should the innocent suffer? And frankly, I think it's the responsible thing to do. This does not preclude us finishing within the next twenty-four hours. We could still move forward. But if this impasse continues - and I certainly,

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

one, hope it doesn't - but if it does, I think we have an obligation to see that only those people involved in the process are cut off from their paychecks, not the men and women who work so hard to make State Government function. I don't see how anybody can be against this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator D'Arco. SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm very interested in what Senator Schaffer said about the innocent, because I don't know how you define who's innocent and who's not innocent. It seems to me that the Governor is getting some heat, and the reason he's getting the heat is obvious. State employees are hard working people. We all know that. They work hard for their money, and they should There's no question about that. And it's a terrible thing that they have to go without a paycheck, because they don't deserve that. They really don't deserve that. Now, what I don't understand about this appropriation is there's nothing in here about public aid. What are we saying to the people on public aid? They don't count? That the poor in this State have no say? We care about State employees. We're concerned. We're so concerned that we want to pass an appropriation so they get their paycheck, but we don't care about people on welfare. Pate Philip, the great Leader over there, said that his constituents are the most powerful in the State, and they work for a living - the inference being people on public aid are lazy, and they don't work, and they don't pay taxes, and they don't deserve any help from the State of Illinois. That's the mentality that is running this General Assembly, and that mentality is why we're at an impasse today and why we can't come to some agreement. We've got to respect every citizen in the State of Illinois, not just those that some people think deserve respect, because all our citizens deserve the right

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

to be respected and loved and needed and cared about. Vote this appropriation down.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, is a very responsible bill, because I'll tell you why. these State employees who are in the middle class -- middle-class people who work, trying to pay their mortgages and what have you, and they can't be paid. Why? Because of political games? That's what you're playing on the other side, and you know it as well as I do. Why has the Governor been hard-fast in his attitude? Because he knows we're a billion eight hundred and fifty million in the hole in the State Treasury. He knows we cannot spend money we don't have. And he also knows that there are certain needs that have to be met. And these people, our secretaries, the people who work the mental institutions for the State, the people who vote -- work in the jails and what have you - they don't What are you going to do? Let all the inmates out? count? think that attitude you have, you probably will. Well, I don't want to let them out. I want them taken care of, and I want decent, self-respecting citizens to be taken care of, and the people who work in the State. You take the secretaries who have been working for many, many hours just in this General Assembly. You don't have any regard for them? Well, I do. They have to live from pay -- paycheck to paycheck. They have families to take care of. I care about that. And this bill does not include anything for the Legislators. So it's nothing self-serving But I think when you talk about a balanced budget - you're willing to do this and that - last year, I heard the eminent Chairman of Appropriations say, "We have a balanced budget." I thought we had the money to pay everything. Well, we don't, but

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

there are certain needs that have to be met. And I think we should stop our politics and stop trying to make the Governor the goat, because he's not. He's very responsible. He knows we can't spend money we don't have. And that's the whole trouble. some of you have circulated little diatribes out blaming the suburbanites and the Collar Counties and everything. For what? Because we want some property tax relief? It's not in this bill. But you people don't seem to be responsible on the other side. All you can think about is tax and spend, tax and spend. I'll vote for your surtax, and I have. But, by golly, let's take care of the needs that have to be met, and we cannot let all these people who have held their jobs and are working and need their money to pay their bills, all because of your different philosophy. And much as I love you, John, I don't agree with you. And I hope that you can pass this bill. I want to see the people paid who work for the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, I see in our printout here that there is some money appropriated to Public Aid in this budget. Could you tell me how much and for what purpose?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

## SENATOR MAITLAND:

To start with, Senator, Public Aid in -- in GRF is -- is fifteen, six twenty-seven.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

That's fifteen million, six twenty-seven? And then can you tell me what it's for? Who's going to get the money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, that's personal services, and it goes to Public Aid -- Department of Public Aid employees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

But there's nothing in here that goes to the recipients. So I guess my question is, why do we need to pay the employees? What are they going to be doing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

# SENATOR MAITLAND:

Senator, I think you know the answer to that question. The —the employees of the Department of Public Aid still have duties, whether or not those other payments are going out and, indeed, indeed, some — some public aid payments have already been made, as you well know, last week.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

No further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

# SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, isn't it ironic that we are here debating whether or not working people,

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

people who work for the State of Illinois - people who pay their taxes, people who are holding down jobs and the people who are actually making this government work - whether they should get paid for work that they have already performed? You know, we are the General Assembly. We are the Legislators of the State, these are the people who make the State work, make it run. ironic, Mr. President, when a federal judge in Chicago - one man can order the State to pay general assistance checks to able-bodied individuals - people who don't work. And Senator --Senator D'Arco, the judge has ordered that those people get their It's kind of ironic that these people who don't work, who monev. don't pay taxes, are getting their money, and at the same time, the Members on the other side of the aisle are trying to block payments to people who work for the State, people who do pay their These are the people who make our government work. know, we owe these people their money. It's not our money theirs. They're our secretaries. They're all the people who work for us, the ones that do all the work that we get all the credit We ought to pay them. "But the other side of the aisle needs these people as hostages. So they aren't going to get paid, they're using them as a political football. President, I'm sorry, but I just cannot understand the priorities of the other side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

# SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's funny how much difference ten days make when we talk about holding people hostage. We had the chance to set those people free on June 30th, and we didn't get enough votes for that temporary budget back then. Now, suddenly it's become a major issue for the people on the right side of the aisle. I think the question we have to ask on this amendment is

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

does this amendment help us resolve the budget crisis, or does it prolong it? And I think that by passing a budget that lasts only one month, we are only going to prolong this crisis. What happens next month when we're still here and we haven't adopted the budget? What happens to those State employees who can only worry about getting paid for one month? Are they going to be able to go and buy a car? Are they going to be able to go out and get a home equity loan? Are they going to be able to make any purchases when we haven't resolved the budget? No, they're not. I think that the proponents -- they've reiterated at two occasions that the General Assembly doesn't get anything out of this budget. Somehow that is to make everyone believe that we're magnanimous here - that we're not getting a dime - therefore, we're doing this in the best interests of the people of the State of Illinois. The best interests of the people of the State of Illinois is to keep us in here and keep us negotiating on budget. The only movement that has taken place has been in the last two days, since there was some pressure on because of the to come up with payments for State employees. То alleviate that pressure at this time would, frankly, make our job much easier here on the Floor of the Senate and in the House, and I don't think that is in the best interest of the people of State of Illinois. I think that what we should do is reject this, and I think that if we do that, we can come up with a budget covering everybody - not just State employees who deserving, but everybody - in a very short period of time. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

# SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. If the public policy of the State of Illinois is going to be resolved by hostage-taking, then vote

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

But if it's going to be resolved in the forum that it ought to be, then it ought to be voted Yes. I have sat in this Body for far too long beyond the date that we ought to be here. And if you want to be here till September, then vote No on this bill. level the playing field to where it ought to be, then vote Yes. You know, it's amazing to me that we ought to be concerned about those people who receive from us statutorily what they ought to and then be so negligent in our responsibility to those who administer those programs for those very same people. Because in the end, the ability of those people that everybody to be concerned about, that have been served by the court order, can only be served by those people who are now saying, "You can't be there after tomorrow because you're not going to If we want to resolve the problems of State Government, let's quit taking hostages. This is not Vietnam. Iran. This is not Irag. This is the General Assembly of the State of Illinois. And if we ever want to get home, there's only one way to go. Release the hostages. And the only way you can do that is to vote Yes on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

# SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I don't think any one of us wants to see one State employee not receive their salary that they're entitled to. But I think the important question is, where was the Republican Party on June the 30th when we had the bill before us requesting a thirty-day extension in paying vital State services on that appropriation bill? There wasn't one Republican vote. Not one. Now, I'm not saying it's right or wrong, but that's the case. I personally thought it was wrong. I thought it was important that we continue State Government and its important vital functions in making sure that

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

the safety of the people of Illinois was foremost; that the people who needed the help from the State of Illinois would receive their And thank God for a federal court judge who ruled that public aid recipients that are entitled to their checks -- receive their checks. And today AFSCME went to the court in Sangamon County and requested this same type of responsibility and personal human self-sacrifice and understanding for their employees. Unfortunately, that was not the case. Responsibility, Everyone realizes everybody has a mortgage to meet, car payments to meet, cost of living to maintain your families on a It's unfortunate that this administration listens to PR people and says, Well, maybe part of the Republican Party National Committee states the fact that we should go to the wall, Edgar and this administration is going to get some political points of being hard-nosed about it. That's wrong. All of know that. What's involved here right now is a matter of face and understanding. And yes, I, for one, want to have these State employees paid. But you know, there is an important picture in this State Government, and that's responsibility. the responsibility is to make sure we have this entire budget before and passed. Now we have been here for ten days - ten overtime days - and we've been critical in the City of Chicago and in this county and in this State, as far as the amount of money that's being expended every day for our per diems. Don't blame We're here to do the job. I'm blaming this administration in not bringing forth the type of responsibility that we can vote upon. This amendment is not a responsible amendment. Where the hell were you when we were there June the 30th asking for your You took people off our side of the aisle on this amendment -- on the bill. I would hope that all of us would realize once and for all, we have a responsibility to this State and to the people of this State, and it is -- the budget behind us, whether it's going

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

to be a temporary income tax for two years, and exactly where this money is going. Every one of the people in the Democratic Caucus have been raising that question every day to the leadership of our side and your side as well. I would hope that this amendment is defeated, so once and for all the people of Illinois will realize there are people concerned in this Body that want to get this behind us once and for all. We want the budget passed. We want to make sure that the revenue is coming, whether it's the City of Chicago or other municipalities in this State, on a continuing basis. In order to do that, please vote No on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

### SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Words are very easy at this very difficult time, and we've heard words like "playing politics," and "political football" and "holding hostage" - that great word - "holding hostage." But if the press wants to know the truth, all they have to do is ask for the roll call, which I have in my hands, on House Bill 3-7-3 on June 30th. And that -was to fund State Government for another month so nobody would be jeopardized and nobody would be without their checks. This is the roll call on House Bill 3-7-3 on June 30th. I think it very last item we did on June 30th. Not one Republican vote, as several have said, on this particular roll call. Republican vote. The press can get it. It's House Bill 3-7-3. So what's the hostage? What's the political football? In this very proposal, House Bill 214, let me tell you about a few of the things that aren't covered, and let's talk about sensitivity. the Department of Revenue budget, grants and -- for the providers, seniors for basic services and pharmaceuticals, are not provided in this bill. So seniors who need those basic needs, the pharmaceuticals, will not receive them under this proposal right

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Under the Department of Revenue, Illinois Affordable Housing Trust Fund, 18.7 million dollars is requested from the Fund for grants, mortgages or loans to low-income, poor people who need this money to pay their mortgages to live. It's not in here. In the Department of Aging budget, let me tell you what's not in here. In the Community Care Program, funding to providers of basic needs services such as Meals on Wheels, homemaker services, counseling, housekeeping services, case management services - not In the Department of Rehabilitation Services budget, let me tell you what's not provided: help for people so that can stay at home, home services for severely disabled persons, including patients on ventilators. The people who help those people stay at home won't get paid under this proposal, so those people will have no alternatives but going to nursing homes. That's not in this proposal. So let's be honest about what we're doing and what we're not doing. We -- we tried to pay these services and fund -- fully fund State Government for another month while the budget went on, under House Bill 3-7-3. Not one Republican vote. But-under this proposal, people in need are not even taken care of,

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

#### SENATOR J.J. JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill that we're on now, the amendment to continue this -- like a continuing resolution like they do in Congress, is -- this is a joke, because we talk about being held hostage. There is no hostage situation. It's like Panmunjom, years ago - they'd debate about what the table -- how the size of the table should be. How it -- whether it should be round or square. That's what happens to our budgeteers. They go to meet and they get this budget down to within a hundred million dollars, which they have now, and then something new comes up. I

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

contend that it is the caps for the DuPage County, or Collar Counties if you will, that we're really debating about. that's what it's really all about. Well, I have a resolution here from my county board in Kankakee County, saying that they don't support property tax caps - passed July 9th, this year. And that's hardly a bastion of Democratic liberal politicians. are Republicans, folks. I have tax bills here on my place in 1990 and 1991, and those taxes have gone down. They've gone down, folks. Seems to me in DuPage County, where all of these good people, these hard working people are, the one mistake they make is they don't elect politicians that are going to watch out their interests. They're -- they're the spending Republicans. They're the ones that are causing all you folks problems, and you have guts to blame the Democrats for that. the That's preposterous, folks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

# SENATOR KELLY:

Well, I'm not going to attack my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But I think this is — I agree with Senator Joyce. This is a silly proposal, because what we're talking about is delaying. And Senator DeAngelis, when you said that we'll be here in September, you better believe we'll be in here September if we were to adopt this amendment, because that would guarantee this Legislature would be back here August 1st and we wouldn't be out of here till at least September and a lot longer than that. So I'm going to oppose this, because I don't think it offers any — it's not even worth consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Severns.

#### SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. There's not

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

of us in this Chamber, I believe, who wants to see anyone receive a check a day late. And that's what really troubles about this amendment, Senator Maitland. Because this amendment doesn't even begin to address the medical providers of this State who have been paid as much as a hundred and twenty days late and beyond, and who have been forced to go out and borrow commercially to be able to pay their bills; to be able to pay their Instead of having this short-term or stopgap solution that will take us a few weeks, I think what we really need to do hope the Governor is listening to this, because he's the one that hasn't permitted it to continue - I hope what we really do allow all of the budget conferees to continue at the table - the Republican side along with the Democrats - to continue table to hammer out this budget that we're so close to solving. That's what we need to do, not a short-term resolution that forgets the people who have provided service to this State, in good faith, and who has sat still three and four and five months late on getting bills paid. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

I've been listening now to the other side talking about how concerned they are about the poor and the needy and those who are in distress. Well, I happen to have a secretary who is trying to raise three children who, without this check, is going to be one of those very needy persons. All of us have people that are on the payroll, on the State payroll, who have to depend on these checks. We don't pay them that much. We don't pay them so that they can put money in their -- in their banks for bad times. Most of these people that we're talking about are living from one paycheck to another. And how in the world you people can sit there, like a bunch of hypocrites, and talk about the poor and the

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

needy, when you know darn well there is a court order that says that the public aid checks are going out. But the people who have been working in our offices, keeping this government going, taking care of those needy that you seem to be so concerned about, emptying the bedpans, and taking care of the -- of the sick, and delivering those meals on wheels, and worrying about those people, are the very ones that you're saying shouldn't get paid. If you don't want to vote for the bill, so be it. But remember, you're the guys that are making our employees not have a paycheck. We're willing to do it. You're not. And that's the bottom line.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. going to speak on this issue, because I think we've had too much pontificating already. But I just think that it's really a little bit absurd. I want to see our people get paid. I want to see our senior citizens get their pharmaceuticals. I want everyone to be taken care of. I don't think we're that far apart. And I what we're doing here today is wrong, and it's wrong not because of the intention of what we're trying to do; it's wrong because we are so close. We are so close. You know, it -- it bugs me a little bit to sit here and think that we're talking about this well into July, whenever the Governor will build his log cabin and said he was prepared to be here all summer. I think he laid down the gauntlet to us then. I think he wants us here. I don't want to be here. I don't want to be here. Senator Raica made a motion the other day - let's go home. But we can't go home, because we haven't done our job. But we're this close from getting our job done. And I'm here to tell you, folks, extra innings are good baseball; but in government, it's just purely bad government, and that's where we're at right now. And I urge a No vote.

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

A quick comment for Senator Fawell. I'll pit my secretary against yours any day. I listened to the secretaries in our complex discuss whether or not they would be paid. And they said that they had real estate taxes due next week; that they had car payments to make, and their faces were very long. And yet, as they listened to the radio today and heard Senator Rock say he would not accept a piecemeal plan, they all stood up and cheered. And I walked out and I said, "What are you cheering about?" And they said, "This is the only way to solve the problem." They were willing to accept a payday that didn't come, if we could resolve the budget and make it permanent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Let me just tell you, folks, I take them as the lights come on. Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, I call the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there are Senator DeAngelis for a second time, the two Leaders, and Senator Maitland, to close. Senator DeAngelis, for a second time.

## SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, you know, it cannot be left unanswered, because there are people who think that the intention of this bill is to do something beyond which it is not. Senator -- Severns, you voted for the bill that took care of the providers who are not being paid. Maybe you've forgotten. They've been taken care of. They have not been paid the overdue bills, but they have the opportunity, on a cash-flow basis, to recover their money. And for those who are welfare recipients, this Body was not so august

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

to -- to take care of their problem. They've been taken care of by the courts. But in the end - in the end - the people that have been forgotten are the people who administer those programs to take care of both of those parts. And the fact of the matter is, what we're voting on tonight is to make it work, so that the end, what we're going to argue about here on this Floor is not who the hostages are - is on what the budget ought to be and how we ought to take care of the problems from a public-policy standpoint that exists in this Body. This vote is not whether public employees should be paid or not. This vote is embarrass the Governor. You vote No, you make Jim Edgar look like yahoo, because the people that don't get paid are going to get upset. And the people who receive what they ought to receive through programs won't get it, because there's nobody there to do it. And you know what? You are messing with the politics of seventy thousand people in this State. That's not fair, and that's what I said before - we could be here till September, because as long as we don't have the responsibility of dealing with their lives and the lives of the people that we are to take care of, there are no issues to resolve. We could be here December, because the pressure is gone. You pass this bill, the playing field becomes level. And we will deal with the issues of the budget, of taxation, the extension of the surcharge, caps, and that's what the issue ought to be all about. Let us not hold those people there who have no dog in this fight. We have put them there because we want them to be there; because, by being there, we don't have to do what we have to do. Let us not absolve ourselves from our responsibility.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Philip.

#### SENATOR PHILIP:

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

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Senate. In regards to Senator Joyce's comments about high real estate taxes, he's absolutely right. The Collar Counties have the highest real estate taxes in the State of Illinois, reason, Senator Joyce, in case you haven't figured it out, is the unfair, unconstitutional School Aid Formula. And as you know, the City of Chicago approximately gets fifty-seven percent of their money from the State of Illinois for their school kids. average school district in DuPage County gets 14.3 percent. get three times as much as I do. How do we make up that extra By taxing ourselves and raising it locally. And they are high. The average tax bill in DuPage County? About seven thousand dollars a year. We have people -- and what disturbs the most is people who were born and raised in my county retire on a fixed income and they can't live there anymore, because they can't pay the taxes. Their mortgage is paid off. They're on a fixed income and they can't afford to stay in the place where their children live, where their relatives live. Why? They can't afford their real estate taxes. Now we from Chicago, what .do we care, right? You have one of the lowest real estate taxes the State of Illinois in the City of Chicago. And you're one of the biggest benefactors. I'd like to have somebody one time show me anything that the City of Chicago doesn't get its unfair share. One time. There isn't anything. You always get more than your share. We're willing to help you, but once in a while ought to turn around and try to help us. Now, you know, this State is in pretty bad shape - and it all depends on who listen to - about a billion nine short. And our conferees, quite frankly, have been working very hard and long on trying to But I'll tell you one thing - it isn't easy to cut around here, because a lot of us have some pet programs. wants to cut Public Aid, general assistance. Nobody wants to cut Mental Health. It's a difficult, difficult thing to do, and

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

why we're here. That's what this argument's about. think in the Senate we've been very responsible. We have cut some of the stuff and sent it over to the House. And quite frankly, I don't think the other Body has been as responsible as we have. Now, I don't think we're that close. There are some people who've got up on the Floor of the Senate and said, "Oh, we're a couple of hundred million dollars off." My conferees tell me maybe three hundred, four hundred, five hundred million dollars off. going to be here. Whether you like it or not, we're going to be here till this budget is balanced. And the Governor gave us a balanced budget, but it was turned down in the House. And I'm going to say, think about those employees - hard working, their taxes, are good guys, as far as I'm concerned, who maybe have a car payment or real estate taxes they have to pay, or something else they're paying on. Half of these employees make under twenty thousand dollars a year. Those are the little guys. But you know what you're going to say? "We're not going to give you your check. You don't deserve it. You can wait." Now we're going to be negotiating this budget so there's no reason we shouldn't give those employees their check, and you know Because we're going to probably -- be here over the weekend. I'm not going to be too happy about that. My family isn't. I'm willing to sit here and cut and do the right thing, but let's let these State employees have their -- what they have worked for, what they have earned, and we ought to vote -- Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

## SENATOR ROCK:

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

My friend, Senator Philip, I thought you were going to, for once,

come to the right conclusion. We should vote No on this proposed

amendment, and we should reject it out-of-hand, because it has to

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

put in the proper perspective. And unfortunately, the proper perspective has nothing whatever to do with the ten thousand State employees that Senator Netsch said would receive their check a day or two late if she didn't have the authorization by noon tomorrow; that they would receive their check probably a day or two late if we didn't have the budget authorization by tomorrow. And the point we're trying to make is that we ought to address the budget. And the fact is the impasse is not that great. When you that we have, at least from the Senate side, subscribed onto, signed onto, agreed to in excess of a billion five hundred million dollars in cuts and/or revenue enhancers - a billion five - and we are literally down, my friends, contrary to all protestations, we are literally down within a striking distance of couple of hundred million dollars. And the fact is that the sheet I work off of shows that we're under a hundred, but my sheet makes some assumptions. And the Republican Leader from the other Chamber is not willing to make any assumptions or any concessions; because, unfortunately, the name of the game is caps. That's what this is all about. I was as surprised as anyone, I can tell you when, at ten o'clock this morning, as we were preparing to the Governor, I was advised that he was scheduling a press conference. And someone, after the press conference, running to my office and gave me a copy of what the Governor had said. No advance warning to any of us who have been meeting good faith. And that's doesn't bother me, except when I read the head note. Now, I don't like newspaper headlines; but when write your own headline, that seems to me to be a little presumptuous. And the headline on his press release "Governor seeks funds to avert shutdown of State Government." Armageddon has arrived. We're going to prevent the shutdown of State Government. And I'm going to ask the same question that I have been asking every day since the first of July to many of

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

individually, to some of you collectively, to my caucus all the time - why are we here? What are we we doing? What's the hangup? We ought not be here on July 10th or July 11th or July 13th. day or two - all right. Concern about the reapportionment, the remap - all right. Keep us here till July 1, so the Governor can veto it - that's fine, I understand that. But why now? What are we doing? Doesn't make a lot of sense. And now we're providing piecemeal budget. And we're not averting a shutdown of State Government. We are saying to State employees, "Sorry, we don't want you to wait a day or two." Because, my friends, in my judgment, I thought we were going to be able to settle this thing this afternoon. And I think it can be settled with some reasonable effort and good faith. And I might quote distinguished statesman from the date of May 9, 1991, who said, "To even suggest, to even suggest we do piecemeal budgeting with the recognition that we're going to be here all the month of July, is unconscionable." Quote, unquote - John Maitland, May 9, 1991. We have a bigger responsibility than to assure the fact that our very loyal and competent and beloved State employees would get their check on time, as opposed to a day or two late. too much that government is responsible for that by Amendment No. l we are simply not addressing. The Governor said, resolve in the next couple of weeks." I don't want to be here the next couple of weeks. There's no reason we can't resolve it tonight, or tomorrow, when we meet again - if the question is the budget. But I suggest to you very strongly, and to all the State employees who are out there who think somehow because their check is a day or two late that they are being held hostage, believe me, you are not. But if indeed you feel you are, know the reason. And the reason is caps on real estate taxes, and that's awful, and we ought to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

Further discussion? If not, Senator Maitland may close.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

#### SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. These, indeed, "are the times that try men's souls." And, Senator Rock, I don't want to be here any longer either. I've got a granddaughter just a few days older than your new granddaughter and I want to see her very badly, as well. It's not pleasant to be here. But even in a good year, when we have the revenues to support the needs, it is difficult in conference to meet that final decision. And we go through it every year. But in like this year, when this Governor - Jim Edgar - was presented with the numbers that he was presented and put together a balanced budget, we absolutely had an obligation. And now on July 10th we still, as Republicans and Democrats, Senators and House Members, have an obligation - have an obligation - to leave here with a balanced budget. Even if we go by your numbers of one hundred million dollars - we are that close - you make that sound though it's so minuscule. That's a hundred million dollars. can't leave here with that kind of a deficit. We don't agree with your figures. We absolutely do not. And we've told the that this afternoon as a result of news conferences that you had. We want to get close together, but we are not there yet. And keep in mind; in a good year when we bring conference committee reports to the Floor, frequently it is difficult to pass some of them because they are controversial. Even once we narrow the gap to zero, as I hope we can do, there are a number of things that have

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

The surcharge and the distribution has to be passed. Hospital assessment, long-term health care have to pass, because thev critically impact upon the Public Aid budget. 45, with the components that will be contained in it, must or all will be for naught. But even with those hanging out there yet and assuming that they pass, we are substantially further apart. and every one of us have a constitutional responsibility to serve our constituents and to serve the State. And for the speaker who admonished us for being here collecting our per diem, saying it is a waste of money, seems to me if it takes longer to bring this gap together, then we have to do that. That's our responsibility. House Bill 373. how many speakers over there had -- have spoken about that - what a marvelous and wonderful bill that was? You know how many agencies or parts and pieces of agencies were served in that bill? Seven. Seven agencies out of nearly ninety State agencies. wasn't a panacea. It simply was not. I am as concerned at hospitals and nursing homes and -- and others who aren't being paid yet as any of you are. But this amendment - this amendment addresses those dedicated, hard-working State employees. hopefully by the time the next check is due, we will have resolved our differences. We are Republicans and Democrats - brothers and sisters. We have an obligation as State Legislators to bring this to a hasty resolution. The Governor is committed to it. I'm committed to it. I think both sides of the aisle are committed to it. Let's continue to work hard, as we've done the last few days, narrow this gap, and please, please, vote Aye on this amendment. And Mr. President, I would request a roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 214. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

65th Legislative Day

July 10, 1991

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 29, none voting Present. Amendment No. 1 fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think we've concluded our business. I would move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Ten o'clock. And I would point out to Senator Philip, it's only forty-two percent of the Chicago school budget that's funded. Forty-two, not fifty-seven. Forty-two. Ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock has moved that the Senate stand adjourned till tomorrow morning at the hour of ten o'clock. Senate stands adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: OOL

ADJOURNMENT

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

92/03/10 11:13:49

45

PAGE PAGE

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JULY 10, 1991

HB-0214	SECOND READ	ING	PAGE	20	
HB-0214	MOTION		PAGE	20	
HB-1838	CONFERENCE		PAGE	12	
HB-1970	CONFERENCE		PAGE	9	
HB-2125	CONFERENCE		PAGE	19	
\$8-0446	CONFERENCE		PAGE	10	
\$8-0872	CONFERENCE	,	PAGE	16	
SB-1030	CONFERENCE		PAGE	18	
SR-0672	RESOLUTION	OFFÉRED	PAGE	2	
SR-0673	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SR-0674	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
SR-0675	MOTION		PAGE	8	
SR-0675	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
SR-0676	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
SR-0677	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
SR-0678	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
SR-0679	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
HJR-0048	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	5	
SJR-0083	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SJR-0084	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SJR-0085	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SJR-0086	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	8	
	CHRISCT MAT				
	SUBJECT MAT	TEK.			
SENATE TO ORDER - PR	ESIDENT ROC	:K	PAGE	. 1	
PRAYER - REVEREND IV	AN JOHNSON		PAGE	1	
JOURNAL - APPROVED			PAGE	1	
JOURNALS - POSTPONED	1		PAGE	1	
RECESS			PAGE	5	
SENATE RECONVENES			PAGE	5	-
MESSAGES FROM THE HO	USE	•	PAGE	5	
MESSAGE FROM THE HOU	SE		PAGE	7	
AD TOURNMENT			DACE	. =	