134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Representative Wanda Sharp of the Progressive Life-giving Word Cathedral in Maywood. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Sharp: "Shall we bow our heads in prayer. Dear gracious heavenly Father we come to You to say thank you. God, we thank You for this day for this is the day that the Lord has made and we will rejoice and be glad in it. God, we thank You for this Assembly and everyone that is in this building, God. put Your arms around every God, we ask You to Representative that is represented here today, gird them I ask You to lead them and guide them. I ask You to bless every Leader that is present, God. Give them the strength, and the knowledge, and the courage to do what You have ordained them to do, God. And most of all, Your word says by your scripture, heal, God. So today I bind cancer, and arthritis, and rheumatism, and high blood, and any sickness as that's among our people, God. God, I ask You to bless our families and our children, God. Protect them God as we are going to do Your work. God lead them and guide them, God. I bind divorce and separations in this House, and I ask, God that You would make us one, united as one, that we would come to do Your will in the House of Representatives. Let this House stand tall and be the best House in the State of Illinois, God, and in the universe. We thank You and we praise You and we give You all the glory. Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. We have no House Democrats excused this morning."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe. Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that all Republicans are present."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 117

Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call. There is a
quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports."

Speaker Madigan: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Tuesday, January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation: recommends 'be adopted' Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 168. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Tuesday, January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 557 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1855; 'be approved consideration' Motion to Concur Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3612, and Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 851. Representative Gash, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measures were referred, action

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

taken on Tuesday, January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be approved for consideration' Motion to Concur on Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1511, Motion to Concur on Senate Amendments 1 to House Bill 4279. Representative Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Tuesday, January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be approved for consideration' Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50. Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

- Speaker Madigan: "On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 4279. Mr. John Turner. Mr. Turner. John Turner."
- Turner, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, the Amendment becomes the Bill, it amends the Statewide Grand Jury Act. It's an initiative from the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. Allows for the formation of a second statewide grand jury to allow crimes in multiple parts of the state to be investigated and prosecuted. Be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. This is final action. Please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gash wish to vote? Representative Gash, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4279. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 851. Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 851 that was considered in the Executive Committee this morning would recommend the Amendment #1 which replaces the Bill and authorizes some technical changes with respect to how the disbursement of the funds would be made. Basically, it would allow for an approved expenditure and this is with regard to the Treasurer's Bright Star Program, and it would permit that the benefits be made payable directly to the beneficiary. And I'd be happy to answer any questions, if there's any."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, in its current form this Bill is no longer the Downstate Police Pension Bill in any way, shape, or form. Correct?"

Burke: "You are right. There is no connection with that."

Black: "Where is that Bill by the way? Is that on the Governor's desk?"

Burke: "I would..."

Black: "I think it is. I think it's 851."

Burke: "I would have to inquire of the Chair."

Black: "So, the Senate Amendment has stripped everything out and it simply becomes a college savings bond vehicle?"

Burke: "Yes, some very basic technical changes with respect to

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

how the disbursements would be made payable. And basically, it's just a very simple matter where any disbursements of that fund would be made directly to the beneficiary as opposed to the person or persons who created the account."

Black: "Okay. Now that I have the right file it makes a great deal more sense to me. I wondered how you were changing the Downstate Police Pension Bill, but I had the wrong file."

Burke: "Well, I wouldn't be the Sponsor of that, Representative."

Black: "So, I've been here too long. It doesn't change the deductibility or any of the good things in the program that we've already established?"

Burke: "No, Sir."

Black: "All right. Fine. Thank you very much. And I apologize for my error."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no further discussion, the Chair recognizes Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Hartke: "Representative Burke, is this a cost-saving program to the Bright Star Program or..."

Burke: "No, it's very technical, Representative. It just encourages the disbursement of the account to go to the beneficiary as opposed to who created the fund. So, if you as a parent were creating this fund for your child, right now, the disbursement would go to you creating it rather than to your child who was the beneficiary. This language would permit the fund to be made payable to the beneficiary, your child."

Hartke: "Okay. So it streamlines the process a little more for the Treasurer's Office which will probably be a cost-saving

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

to the program."

Burke: "I suppose. I'd give you that."

Hartke: "Okay. Thank you."

Burke: "Thanks."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Mr. Burke to close."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Members of the Body understand, this is a very important program to the young people of our state. It gives them the opportunity to provide... gives our parents the opportunity to provide for a child's future education. And again, this is a very technical change, and one that does not conflict with the intent of the Bill originally that would provide for the college savings plan for the future. And I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 851. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, is the Representative Gash switch working? Okay. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner, did you wish to record yourself? Representative Collins, did you wish to record yourself? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a... rather the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Representative Gash seek recognition?"

Gash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 4279, I intended to vote 'yes', and my switch wasn't working, and I had just voted 'yes' for it in committee."

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. House Bill 1511. Mr. Durkin. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Durkin, go ahead."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1511 is a Amendment that was brought by the State's Attorney Association in response to a United States Supreme Court decision this past summer Apprendi v. New Jersey in which the U.S. Supreme Court held that courts cannot impose the extended term sentence provisions under the State Law unless the defense is given pretrial notice of the aggravating factor, and it was proven beyond a reasonable doubt before the trial court for the trier of fact. What this Bill does it sets out the charging scheme that must be done if, prosecution, if they are going to seek extended term sentencing which is sentencing beyond the statutory maximum for any offense under the Criminal Code. I'm willing to take any answers (sic-questions). This is an Agreed Bill by the Prosecution Association. And I believe that there's no objection... there's no opposition at this point."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1511? Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Slone, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a rather... The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 50. Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Senate Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. What it does, simply, is it increases the eligibility standard from 125% to 150% dealing with the low-income heating and Energy Assistance Program that's administered by DCCA. Illinois received about, roughly, 25 million more dollars from the Federal Government recently, and they need authorization to spend this money, as well as, most importantly, is to provide more opportunities for our indigent citizens and elderly people to help pay their heating bills during this winter season. As you know, the December cold snap was pretty harsh on citizens We're into the first week in January, and it Illinois. could be a very long winter. So, this is a modest proposal. It's going to assist about 19 thousand more families in the State of Illinois. It does not take care of every eligible household in Illinois, unfortunately, but it does help somewhat. And for those of us that were here with the Deregulation Bill, the charge that we put on the gas and electric bills does contribute to a substantial amount of money used to assist people in the weatherization program, as well as low-income energy heating assistance. So, with that I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50. And I will be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative, you say that this is \$25 million that comes from the Federal Government?"

Novak: "Excuse me, Mr. Parke. I think it's 24.7 million."

134th Legislative Day January 9, 2001

Parke: "And is this allocated to every state in the union?"

Novak: "Pardon me?"

Parke: "Is this kind of money been allocated to every state in the union?"

Novak: "Correct. I think the total is about \$300 million."

Parke: "And it can only be used to help low-income families?"

Novak: "Correct. It goes right to the LIHEAP Program administered by DCCA."

Parke: "Was there anyone in opposition to this in committee?"

Novak: "No. No, there wasn't anyone. And there had to have been at least 25 witness slips supporting the Bill."

Parke: "You earlier said that there will be some people who will not qualify for this because there's not enough money, or we have not budgeted enough money for them. Is that correct?"

Novak: "Well, Mr. Parke, the simple... the answer to that question is we don't have enough money. There's roughly 700 thousand households in this state that are eligible... that would be eligible under the federal poverty guidelines to receive low-income heating assistance, and I don't even know, I think we might be somewhere at half. The Deregulation Bill, that you helped pass, provided for a great infusion of dollars into that program. What we're doing here with this 24.7 million is we're increasing the poverty level from 125% to 150%, and therefore, broadening the category or the number of people, families of four, specifically, to participate in the program."

Parke: "Well, I think that's a good idea, but what is it going to be 'first come, first serve' and the others are just out of luck? What are we going to do for the other people?"

Novak: "The money will be allocated by the state. It'll be put into the same pot of money so to speak that's allocated to

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

the county community service agencies rather it's a community action program or whether in Kankakee we call it Kankakee County Services, Inc., and people that fall within the income guidelines are eligible to apply same as it's always been."

Parke: "But again... All right, but again, you said this is only half of what's necessary. What are we going to do for the other half that won't... there won't be enough money for them?"

Novak: "Well, I mean that was a rhetorical question. I mean, Mr.

Parke, if we can get together and everybody in this Body,
and the Senate, and the Governor's Office and find some
more money so we can help all those other eligible
households that can apply for it, but the resources just
aren't there. So, if we can find a way this early spring
we should do it."

Parke: "So, you're talking about some kind of a supplemental budget? Is that what we're talking..."

Novak: "That's a possibility, I think. I mean, I think we could discuss that with the Governor's Office. We can maybe look at some other resources that might be around there, but I think we need to capture as many federal dollars as we can. And this is an effective utilization of that money that's coming."

Parke: "Was there any talk in committee, or in presentation of this legislation, about cutting the tax... the state tax on this to bring relief to all the citizens of the state, or are we going to do this Band-Aid to take care of half the people that are in need? Do you..."

Novak: "Well, you know, that's an issue that's been approached before. My good friend from Danville who sits on that committee, we spoke about that this morning. We've talked

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

to the media about this, about the state utility tax on natural gas and propane. We've talked about the 135 municipalities in this state that impose a municipal utility tax on top of the state tax which to me seems very egregious and unfair. But those municipalities have the power to levy those taxes. I suppose we can do a lot of jawboning if we wish, and hopefully, encourage our neighbors at the municipal level to abate that tax during the heating season, but I haven't seen too much movement on that part."

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body, I think that this is a good idea. I'm gonna vote for it, but that's not enough. If the need is double this, then this Body has the responsibility to work with Representative Black to push through his legislation to bring some relief, not only to low-income, but to all those that are having a problem paying their fuel bills. I would encourage the legislative Leadership of this Body to make this a priority to work with Representative Black to make sure that his legislation is called, and that we all have an opportunity to vote on that legislation, also. So, thank you very much, and I plan on voting for this worthwhile Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I concur in the Gentleman's Motion for Concurrence. With the number of people we have in our state suffering with the cost of home heating fuel now, it would be unconscionable for anyone to vote against this Bill. This is a Bill we must move along today. In fact, it's too bad we can't include more in this. Many middle-class people who are way beyond the poverty level still are having difficulty paying their

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

heating bills. And I think it would be appropriate for this Body to make a loud and clear statement today, and then during the Spring Session, in the very early part of the Spring Session, try to come up with a way that we can help other homeowners, and other citizens of our state, take care of their bills. I think you'll agree with me when I say that I'm really surprised a Bill like this got out of the Illinois Senate with the kind of approach they usually have to helping people in need in the State of Illinois. But I'm pleased it's here today, and I hope you'll join us in the unanimous vote of support for this excellent piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have held public hearings in my district over the weekend, and one of the things that we have realized is exactly what we're hearing today that over 500 thousand residents in this state who qualify for some sort of assistance who make \$35 thousand a year or less are not going to receive any assistance whatsoever. checking in with DCCA, I realize that in order to qualify they use a matrix, and the matrix is based on where one lives, the qualifying income, and some other factors. think it would be in the best interest of the State of Illinois, as well as DCCA, to provide for that matrix to insure that we do everything we can to be more inclusive and bring in those working-class families who need this kind of assistance the most. I don't know if there are any plans to address this, but I have promised my constituents that I would stand up and make this point. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Chair?"

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I filed a written Motion yesterday pursuant to the applicable House Rule that the posting requirements be waived so that my very modest tax relief proposal 4743 could be heard in the Revenue Committee, and I noticed that Motion doesn't appear on the Calendar. Did that get lost? I mean, not that I was optimistic it was gonna happen, but I'd like to see it on the Calendar if at all possible. It didn't appear. Did the Clerk lose that? I think the Motion that appears tries to discharge Rules Committee..."

Speaker Madigan: "Yeah. Mr..."

Black: "...and I had presented that Bill on the 16th of November in Revenue Committee. Of course, I'm allowed two bites of the apple. And at that time I didn't realize we would be on January 8th and 9th, so Monday morning I did file a Motion to suspend the posting requirements just in case the Revenue Committee met, and that didn't get on the Calendar."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Black, as you stated, the Motion was to suspend the posting requirements for a committee..."

Black: "Yes."

Madigan: "...and the Motion..."

Black: "... and the committee, evidently, isn't going to meet?"

Speaker Madigan: "Correct. And so,..."

Black: "I see."

Speaker Madigan: "... when we were advised that there'd be no meeting of the committee, somehow your Motion was lost."

Black: "I understand. I think it's a moot point, yes."

Speaker Madigan: "A strong wind came here and blew it away."

Black: "Yes, I understand. I can accept the fact that it's a

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

moot point."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, maybe it was a light wind."

Black: "I'm getting too old to be Don Quixote, Mr. Speaker. I'11 not raise that question again. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, before us if I might? I appreciate Representative Novak's and forthright explanation of this Bill committee. I think Representative Parke has excellent job as has Representative Garrett. This Bill highly targeted to extremely low-income seniors and to what I would call 'the working poor'. It does very little, in fact, probably nothing for middle-class working families who also need some relief from historic high heating bill prices that we have seen. Obviously, my attempt to hold in abeyance the State Utility Tax has died a rather slow and painful death, and it would be useless to try to resurrect it because the winter will be over before we could get any action on it. I still think, as Representative Garrett said, it behooves us to look at additional ways that we might be able to help people get through what is going to be a very difficult winter. Be that as it may, this Bill before us which is all we will have a chance to vote on, certainly helps, but you know I've taken a lot of criticism in the press by unnamed spokespersons for the government administration, well, one was named a Department of Revenue spokesman said, this would only be two bucks a month. I extend an open invitation to him to visit my district in a public meeting and make that point to people who are struggling to pay 580 and \$600 a month heating bills. he thinks it's only \$2 a month, I can show him some utility bills that would refute that. And there was other people who said, well, we wouldn't know whether the tax was abated. Ladies and Gentlemen, look at your utility bill.

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

That tax is a separate line item. It would be very easy for you to track whether or not that tax had been removed and if you can do simple math on the cost per therm, can figure out whether the 5% was taken off your bill. I digress, that Bill is dead, I, at least, had a hearing, brief as it may be. So the Bill before us, certainly, is a step in the right direction to help some of our most vulnerable citizens struggle to pay heating bills. But the cost of this program is not insignificant, it will approach \$175 million during this winter season. Now that's not General Revenue money I'll grant you that, but it is a tax. It's all tax money whether you go to Washington and get an extra appropriation. Where do you think money from Washington comes from? It's all tax money, basically, that we'll spend. It is a step in the right direction. I join with Representative Garrett. I think we'll be debating this Bill in some of the early days of the 92nd General Assembly. I do appreciate your work on this Representative Novak, your forthright honesty in committee today. This is but one step we can take, I think we should take, and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to commend Representative Black for the work that he performed earlier on low-income energy and natural gas prices. And I for one, wholeheartedly supported House Bill 4743, which I think Representative Black showed a great deal of vision and commitment to this overall issue. I think it was an excellent approach that he took, and I think it's unfortunate that, that Bill didn't move forward. Having said that now, I do want to commend the Mayor of Chicago, and the Governor of the State of Illinois. I had

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

the pleasure of sitting with them in their press conference in Washington, D.C., when the Mayor of Chicago announced his low-energy income assistance program, as well as the Governor of the State of Illinois announcing his support for an energy commission. I think this is needed. I think that House Bill 50 before us right now needs our support. I would encourage all Members on the Republican side of the aisle to support this very important piece of legislation. And in doing so, I want to commend the Governor and the Mayor of Chicago for their bipartisan cooperation on this effort. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak to close."

Novak: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Daniels, thank you for the worthwhile comments. I think you hit it right... hit the nail on the head. And, Mr. Black, thank you for your assistance, and Mr. Parke. Mr. Speaker, an inquiry with..."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Novak: "Yes, with leave of the Chair, would it be appropriate to add every Member as a cosponsor to this Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has requested leave that all Members be added as cosponsors to House Bill 50. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Novak to close."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an important Bill since we're faced with an onslaught of wintery weather and we don't know how long it's gonna last. We have an eligibility to receive almost \$25 million from the Federal Government. We're increasing the poverty threshold, so we're gonna be able to allow about 19 thousand more households in the State of Illinois, indigent people, elderly people, struggling mothers with children, just trying to make ends meet. So, it's not the answer to the

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

entire problem. I just wish, and I know Mr. Black echos my thoughts, that the Mayor of the great City of Chicago, and the Mayor of Naperville, and the mayor of about 135 other communities around the state that impose a municipal utility tax would encourage their city councils to pass an ordinance and abate that tax during this winter season. It's not a lot of money but 5 or \$10 extra a month could certainly put another meal on the table. So with that, I'll ask my colleagues to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there appears Senate Bill 168. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 168. It allows the board of trustees of a fire district to enter into a multiyear contract, and it will bring it up to three years instead of two years to appoint the fire chief. It also allows the board of trustees to appoint the fire chief. I move for its favorable passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 168. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Report on Senate Bill 168?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 168. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Regular Calendar, there appears House Bill 3612. Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 3612 would amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act, and the Senate Amendment would propose to annex 564 acres of land for mixed use, primarily single-family residential homes located within the Village of South Barrington. The Illinois EPA has approved the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission's recommendation of transfer of this land to the Water Reclamation District. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3612. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3612?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Klingler, did you wish to vote? Klingler, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3612. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, on

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

the Order of Consideration Postpone, there appears Senate Bill 1397. Mr. Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1397 is a Bill that could... creates the Industrial Hemp Bill. It not only calls for a study, but also defines industrial hemp. There's been considerable discussion on that. If there's any questions, Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to answer any of those questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lawfer has moved that the House pass his Bill, Senate Bill 1397. And is there any discussion on this matter? Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, can you again review with me and the Body the concern that people have expressed to me, as well as many of the Members, about whether or not there is actually... can be used for the purpose of... for drug usage. Can you explain to us why that that's not practical with your legislation? And also emphasize, again, that this is a study, and who's doing it, and what do you think it'll cost?"

Lawfer: "Okay, first of all, this Bill does not legalize marijuana. It does not legalize industrial hemp. It calls for a study both by the University of Illinois College of Agriculture as well as the Southern Illinois University College of Agriculture to do a study under very controlled conditions, very secure conditions that... so that no individuals... unauthorized individuals are not allowed in that area. It does... only calls for a study or asks that these universities obtain the necessary permits to see

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

whether there are varieties that can be grown in Illinois and this is under a very controlled condition. I know there's been concerns that the State Police have. I will be glad to address them in future legislation, trailer legislation, but I think at this present time this Bill that has passed the Senate 49 to 9 is a very contained, very limited amount of study that to see whether this could be a viable alternative crop for the State of Illinois."

Parke: "What percentage of the drug actually is in the hemp that would be grown on this study?"

Lawfer: "Okay. This defines industrial hemp and defines that industrial hemp will have a THC, a drug content, of less than .3%. My understanding is marijuana could range anywhere from 5 to 25%. This would define industrial hemp as having a very low THC and hopefully, the study or genetic engineering can be accomplished that could be reached a 0 THC, but it defines industrial hemp at that a very low THC."

Parke: "This is gonna be a protected study, in other words, only authorized personnel will be allowed in the growing area and also is it... when will it end and how will the report be distributed?"

Lawfer: "It's my understanding, Representative, that it will be very controlled and by that I mean, security fences, cameras, in that regard. I think the Bill calls for a study to be completed by January 1 of next... of this... next year. I'm not sure that that can be accomplished at this time. That's why I'm referring to a possibility of trailer Bills that will be necessary maybe to extend the date of this study, as well as, depending on how and when they could get the permits and also, you know, what other issues may need to be addressed such as the State Police

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

have asked in that regard."

Parke: "Will you make sure that the, if, in fact, this Act becomes law and we do this, will you let the Legislators know what the results were from the study? Is it your intention to share those results with us?"

Lawfer: "Right. I think that as this study moves forward I'll be glad to keep everybody advised of that and you know, when we would be able to get the permits, when we would be able to get the seeds that are available to the universities and I think, the agriculture industry is very much interested in this and it will receive a lot of reports in that regard. So I do plan on doing that, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Does the Illinois Farm Bureau support this legislation?"

Lawfer: "The Illinois Farm Bureau supports this and my understanding is the Illinois Farmers Union also supports this legislation."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I just rise also in support of Senate Bill 1397. Just to remind the Members, I think the last time we debated this Bill Representative Bill Black made some very strong points, I believe, in terms of the validity of doing research in this area. Let me remind you, for anyone that has any concern again, this is only a research project. This is not legalizing industrial hemp. It is only allowing research to be conducted. We will join nearly half of the states in proceeding in this and I would argue strongly that if we do not proceed along this line to at least do the research on the ability to grow industrial hemp that other states in the Midwest and indeed throughout the country, will be so far ahead of us that when the markets open up for this, which I think many of us believe

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

it will, Illinois will be left in the dust. It's not fair to our agricultural community; it isn't fair to the state's economy. And I would urge you to vote for this very important research project. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand in support of Senate Bill 1397. know, I'm a farmer and the agricultural industry in the State of Illinois has not enjoyed the economic boom that the rest of society has enjoyed the last several years. Representative Lawfer has brought to us this piece of legislation which will allow for a study. A study, a research project to the University of Illinois on the concept of what to do to help agriculture in Illinois and this is one of those things. Industrial hemp could be an answer for some farmers in Illinois to plant an alternative I might remind you that several years ago the University of Illinois was doing years and years of research on an unknown plant here, not native really to Illinois a native to China, and that was soybeans. No one thought we would ever have soybeans develop into anything in particular, but today the soybean is the number two crop in the State of Illinois. And I'm not suggesting that industrial hemp will be a number two crop in Illinois ever, however, it does lead to a lot of potential. But to get to that potential we have to do a lot of research and study. This piece of legislation is that first step to do that study. The University of Illinois is willing to try under their research farms; it will be a controlled study. will not be, I guess, out to legalize industrial hemp in any way, but determine whether it could and would be used for a valuable product here in Illinois, an alternative for

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Illinois farmers. I stand in support of Representative Lawfer's Bill and I think that each and every one of you should too. I know that many of you may have voted against it because you were afraid of what might happen, but this is a study. It is a research project. It's on a limited scale, a limited basis, the University of Illinois, possibly Southern Illinois. But I ask you and beg you to support this piece of legislation to get this research started. It's not a quick answer; it's not a quick fix. But it is something that is absolutely needed to be looked at seriously. I'd appreciate your support of Senate Bill 1397."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise, once again, to support Gentleman's effort in this Bill. For those of you who subscribe to Capitol Fax, I think Rich Miller, whether you always agree with Rich Miller or not, I think he had a very interesting article in today's Capitol Fax. I will put my record on supporting tough penalties for illegal drug use up against anybody in this chamber and I, for one, resent the overkill and the over emotionalism that have been used against the Sponsors of this Bill and anyone who has enough courage to vote for it insinuating that we somehow are trying to back door the legalization of marijuana. That is a canard that needs to be nipped in the bud and I resent The hyperbole used to try and defeat implication. this Bill has been completely over the top and if any of those people from IDEA or anybody else want to come to my district and have a public meeting and debate with me about my record on getting tough on those who misuse drugs, so be it. You have an open invitation. All this Bill does is to

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

call for a study as others have eloquently stated and if you read Rich Miller's article today, I just want to quote one sentence from Don Brisken, a University of Illinois professor of plant physiology. 'There are many unique qualities of hemp fiber that make it ideal for construction material. Hemp fiber can actually make a stronger and lighter composite plastic than fiberglass and when hemp fibers break, they don't shatter like fiberglass, making a safer product, say for the interior of a car.' We don't know whether this is a viable product for Illinois farmers We won't know until the study is done and the or not. study is literally under lock and key. It doesn't legalize marijuana; it doesn't legalize industrial hemp; it doesn't diminish any penalties for the use of marijuana and I don't know how it can send a mixed message to the school children this state who, in all likelihood, won't even know this study's going on. I suppose George Washington Carver faced the same kind of criticism. Why do you want to study the peanut, George? There ain't no future in peanuts. I suppose when soybeans hit the market there were those who said, 'Why do you wanna study soybeans? You mean, we might eat a soybean?' Well, today's soy products are an integral part of many of the things that we eat and are also used in medicine, lubricants and what have you. Soybeans and corn are a depressed market and if you want to save Illinois agriculture, then vote for this Bill and give those who are experts in the field the opportunity to see whether or not hemp fiber can be a viable, cash crop for the Illinois agricultural market. What in the world can be construed in that sentence as softening my position in opposition to marijuana or any other illegal drug? I'm a parent; I raised two children. I know what it's like to do that

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

today in this drug-related culture, but to insinuate those of us who are in favor of this study somehow are soft on drugs, that is a canard; I resent it and I resoundingly will vote 'yes' and the invitation stands to any of you. You want to come in my district and debate me on who's tougher on drugs; come on over, I look forward to it. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I opposed this Bill previously and I continue to oppose it. There are reasons that are neither emotional nor unfair for why this Bill is on Postponed Consideration. It has been voted upon by this chamber before and it failed. That's what we do occasionally with Bills that are something called Postponed Consideration. opinion, having served here for quite sometime, that there are many pieces of legislation over which we will have differences of opinion. That does not mean we do not have respect for those whose view is different than our own. have nothing but respect for the Sponsor of this Bill and for all of those who support it. But I happen to be one of those people who believes that because this product can be put to certain types of uses, which not one of us would endorse and which we most certainly would not want our own children or any of this state's children to use in that and it is for that reason that I believe the kind of consideration we need to have for our children, the kinds of programs we need to promote to fight drug abuse are more important even than any attempts to support the agriculture industry. Mr. Speaker, many of my forefathers and foremothers in Illinois were farmers; not one of them was anything but a wholesome person. They would not want the

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

farmers of today to be engaged in raising crops that were anything other than wholesome. I stand in opposition to this Bill and I am neither frantic nor emotional as the previous speaker accused some of the opponents of this Bill of being. There really are justifiable reasons to be opposed to this Bill that have nothing to do with the character of any Member of this chamber or whether one respects the Sponsor. The Sponsor of this Bill is a wonderful man and I know he is an advocate for agriculture which is what he should be. We all are, but first, we need to be advocates for our children. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins."

Biggins: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support, unlike the last time this Bill was up for a vote, on Senate Bill 1397. I would defer the Members on their computers today to a site on the Web called worldnetdaily.com. It's a very good conservative site, source of many good conservative articles and there's an article in there today entitled, Put Hemp in Your Tank and it offers numerous reasons and listings for the use of hemp, many of which have been referenced on this floor as well. It also cites other articles of a similar nature that are used to support the use of hemp. And how in this case, although the article doesn't state how it'd be beneficial to Illinois, it lists advantages for Illinois in the production and manufacture of it, and started by the research as indicated in Senate Bill 1397. So, I'm happy to stand in support of Representative Lawfer's Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And I rise in support to the Gentleman's legislation today. Representative Lawfer has long been a

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

very knowledgeable advocate of agriculture issues. matter of fact, I just returned from a conference of the agricultural states which included Iowa, and most of the Midwest states on issues pertaining to agriculture and the crisis in the farming community now. Everything ranging from producer production act to looking for new markets and ways to help the family farm organizations which are in serious trouble right now. And I commend him for having the courage to bring this legislation forward. It's intention is honorable; there's been a lot of hype about it. And looking at some of the values of the hemp products which are to be used in construction, other materials, think, is probably a proper thing to do and it was brought up by many other states that are looking at alternate uses for crops. And I just believe that he should be supported in this legislation and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lawfer to close."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank you for allowing this Bill to come forward. I want to thank the Sponsors of this Bill. I think there's been a very thorough discussion on this Bill. I think that most of the questions have been answered and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Turner, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 67 'ayes', 47 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears House Bill 557. Mr. Joseph Lyons. Joseph Lyons."

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

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

House. I present to you today House Bill 557. It amends the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act by adding a new Section to extend the corporate limits of the Water Reclamation District to include approximately 60 acres in Southeastern Cook County. The parcel is unincorporated area bounded by the municipalities of Chicago Heights and Glenwood. The Water Reclamation District would service the wastewater needs of a combined cycle, natural gas-fired intermediate load electric power plant proposed to be built on the parcel. Now, for the record, there is no known opposition to this. The County Commissioner, Commissioner Sims is in favor of this. Representative Giglio, whose district this is, problem with this. And this is not considered a peaker plant to solve any... to answer any questions that may be raised by this. And I would be happy to answer any additional questions, and would ask for your consideration and favorable vote on this."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report and the Chair recognizes Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Skinner."

Skinner: "Is the power plant going to use natural gas?"

Lyons, J.: "To the best of my knowledge, Representative, yes, natural gas."

Skinner: "And is this is Nycor's delivery system?"

Lyons, J.: "Whether it's Nycor or Peoples, I'm not sure. It's South Suburban, Representative. Probably Nycor."

Skinner: "Probably Nycor. One of the problems with peaker plants or cogeneration plants which are run by natural gas is that, obviously, it affects the price of natural gas on the

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

margin. The last time I asked Northern Illinois Gas what percentage of gas was being used for peaker plants and cogeneration plants it was 14%; nationwide it is 16%. I really think this is one of the reasons that natural gas prices are higher than they have ever been before."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 557?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 93 'ayes', and 23 'noes'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 557. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Consideration Postponed, there appears Senate Bill 1477. Mr. Fowler."

Fowler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1477, Section 7.1 refers to rentals, charges, and fees with respect to any and all leases, easements, right-of-ways, privileges, and permits made or granted by the board. The board may agree upon and collect the rentals, charges, and fees that are deemed to be in the best interests of the district. And these rentals, charges, and fees must be used to defray the reasonable expenses of the district and to pay the principal and interest upon any revenue bonds issued by the district. Back in November when I first presented this, there was several concerns that this Bill would permit another fee increase or an additional fee. I would like to report that the wording that I just read to this Body is identical, identical to wording found in another location within

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Chapter 70. All this Bill does is simply move it from where it is currently located to another location in the statutes. It does not give the Shawneetown Port Authority any more authority than what the current statutes provide for, none whatsoever. And the Bill did pass out of the Senate by a vote of 59-0. I'll be happy to try to answer any questions that you might have regarding this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fowler moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1477. Is there any discussion? Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I remember a previous debate on this Bill. A couple of things that I really don't understand about this Bill. In the Shawneetown Regional Port District, as I read this, correct me if I'm wrong, there are no limits placed on charges and fees that could be authorized by this port district. Is that your intent?"

Fowler: "That is the way, right now, Representative Black, that... they have that authority now as do the other port districts in the state."

Black: "All right, but as staff points out there are 14 regional port districts in the state and only five of them have this open-ended fee structure. And I... you know, really I guess I'm asking you a rhetorical question. I wonder if it's good public policy to tell any government body you charge what you think you have to charge to do your job, we will place no limits on what you decide to charge. Well, I mean, that raises the question somebody who thinks the charge may be excessive, other than hire an attorney, what recourse do you have? I just... I really... and I don't know the answer, that's why I say it might be a rhetorical question. Do you think it's good public policy to tell any

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

port district, 'Hey, whatever it takes, whatever you think is right, whatever you think is fair and sufficient, you go ahead and levy those charges.' Doesn't that give you some trepidation? I mean, it's not in my district, it's down in yours, and I'll defer to your judgement."

Fowler: "Well, inasmuch as they have that authority now, Representative Black, you know, I have no problem with it, it says just and reasonable fees. In the case of the Shawneetown Port Authority it has seven members on that board, four of those are appointed by the Governor, the other three members are appointed by the mayors, the three villages within the Shawneetown Port District. So again, they have that authority already. It's not something that we're voting here this morning to grant to them."

Black: "One of the interesting things about the Shawnee Port District, the Shawneetown, excuse me, is that they also operate an airport, as well as, operate, regulate, or lease any body of water that's adjacent to this district. Is there anything in the underlying or the substantive legislation that says you can't use these fees generated by water craft to subsidize the operation of the airport or vice versa for that matter?"

Fowler: "Well, Representative Black, I'm quite familiar with that area and I've lived there all my life and there is no airport in the county, much less within the confines of the port authority. I know that's what the statute says but..."

Black: "Yeah. Well, this is what staff tells me. Correct me if I'm wrong. Currently, the Shawneetown Regional Port District may only impose rentals, tolls or fees for the use of any public airport. The district also has the power to levy taxes and issue general obligation bonds by a front

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

door referendum. Are they levying any fees or taxes for the future construction or feasibility study of an airport, or has staff made an error here?"

Fowler: "No, I'm not saying staff made an error, but I have no knowledge of any intent..."

Black: "Okay."

Fowler: "... whatsoever to construct an airport."

Black: "Okay. As you'll recall, I asked you the last time commercial traffic I can understand why a fee would be levied on commercial traffic, but this also includes recreational boaters. If I go down to your area, and I have been down in your area before fishing and what have you, and if I understand this if I get into the port district that this Bill applies to and want to launch my pleasure boat, I would be subject to whatever fee they wanted to charge, and generally speaking, other than a very small access fee, most pleasure boaters are not subjected to these kinds of charges. And when we first debated this, I didn't fully understand that, why... commercial traffic I understand, but why this attempt to levy fees on pleasure boaters?"

Fowler: "Representative Black, in the area served by this port authority, there are two boat launches where you can launch your... there are no fees charged for the services there. I simply construe that to mean that if when you're tooling down the river and your boat breaks down or you need fuel, then you pull in there and it's no different then on your way down to Springfield, if you have car trouble or need fuel or whatever, you'd pay for those services. But again, I want to emphasize the two boat ramps there on the river, there are no launching fees imposed upon the boater."

Black: "And I think that's the point at which we may have a

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

disagreement. The legislation would give the authority the ability to collect charges and fees which would then revert to the port district. And staff says, and that would include barges, and pleasure boats. So, it's a fee that isn't specified in the legislation, and a fee that could be levied by the district, and there is nothing in the legislation that says what a reasonable fee might be. I think that is a point of some legitimate concern by those who would own a bass boat or, you know, they would want some constructive notice as to what the fee is gonna be before they head down for a weekend of fishing in Southern Illinois. And I'm sure that it would be published at some point, but this doesn't give boat owners a real good opportunity to say, well is it \$5, is it \$10, I mean, give me some idea. This legislation is extremely open-ended. I guess that's the concern I have with it."

Fowler: "Well, it is consistent, I think, Representative Black, with other..."

Black: "Well, as you've said that, right."

Fowler: "... port districts. And what I'm proposing here, again, is already in the statutes, though I don't think the vote here today is gonna..."

Black: " I understand that..."

Fowler: "Yeah."

Black: "... but only five port districts have that open-ended ability. The other nine do not. So, I guess it's a public policy question and I'll certainly defer... You know, obviously, if the fee is excessive, the law of diminishing returns set in. I mean, voters will vote with their trailer and their vehicle. I mean, if it's excessive fees, they're just not going to go there..."

Fowler: "Yeah, I agree."

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

- Black: "So, I mean, there's some... there's at least some internal pressure to be competitive, but and heaven knows, your district and mine need to develop every conceivable tourism hook or anything else we can in light of our economic development difficulties. But, I'd be less than honest if I told you I just... I'm having a very difficult time understanding what the ultimate purpose of this Bill is, but I do thank you for answering the questions."
- Fowler: "Yeah. I might add too that I think this has been in effect since 1961, and they still have not charged any fees for you launching your personal craft."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, Mr. Fowler to close."
- Fowler: "I might just add in closing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this passed out of the Senate by a vote of 59-0. It would indicate to me that probably they didn't share some of your concerns, Representative Black. So, in closing I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House pass House Bill... rather that the House pass Senate Bill 1477. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Four people have not voted. Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Lang, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there were 63 'ayes', and 53 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 1855. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1855, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. Amendment #1 would increase the district office allotment by \$4 thousand for the House of Representatives, and by 6 thousand for each Senate district office. And the COLA will be based upon the Employment Cost Index, wages and salaries, by occupation industry groups, state and local workers as published by the U.S. Department of Labor. This is the same COLA that Members of the General Assembly receive each year. And the COLA would be beginning July 1st, 2002. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, first of all, let me say I intend to vote for this Bill. Expenses seem to always rise faster than dollars to pay them. But, there's one concern, and I think it was raised in committee by Representative Poe, and we were trying to discuss this and we don't have a real good answer. I mean, obviously, the Senate district is bigger, has more people, but then they... and consequently, they get more money to operate a district office or two, but this builds in an ever-increasing disparity by that COLA. Assuming you get a 4% bump in your district office allotment, there constantly... instead of being relatively close together as we always have been, over a 10 year period they will begin to move considerably beyond what our district office allowance would be, and I'm not sure that that was the intent of the legislation as it started out

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

when we first went to district office allotment. I mean, I won't be here ten years from now, but at some point the disparity between a district office and a House Member, and a district office expense and a Senate Member, will be several thousand dollars apart."

Burke: "Well, maybe you began to answer what your concerns were,

Representative, when you did indeed suggest that the

districts are double in terms of the constituency."

Black: "Correct. Correct."

Burke: "And I believe that maybe just discussing the issue the Senate possibly could have come to us with, in fact, double what our allocation would be. There is, and Representative Poe did raise the issue in committee this morning, and I don't know that this would answer your concern, but there would be a 5% cap on the increase. It may still..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Burke: "...there might be disparity in the amounts over a period of time, and as you said, in ten years, you know, maybe none of us will be around to worry about it."

Black: "I know you're looking at one who can guarantee you he won't be around here 10 years from now. But, I think it's a step in the right direction and at some point they may have to look at narrowing the gap. Those who do this job, as you know, work very hard. We're often the targets of criticism, and sometimes, justifiably so. But those who have a good legislative aide and run a good district office constituent operation, it is believe me, a full-time job and then some. And it is very hard to find people who will do the work that we do, and treat people with dignity and respect, because they're not always happy when they come to us, for a 12 thousand or a \$14 thousand salary. Those days are gone. So, I certainly have no problem with this. And

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

those who come after us will have to, perhaps, address the ever-widening disparity between the districts. But I commend you for bringing this forward. I know my landlord will be most appreciative. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. T think that the disparity between Senate and the House office allotments reflects the reality that what this money is about. is not lining Legislators' pockets it's about providing adequate services to our constituents. Senators, as we know, have twice as many constituents as House Members do, and it seems to me that a disparity is more than justified. Let me reiterate. This is about service to our constituents. It's about the postage we pay to communicate with them, the telephone bills that respond when we answer their phone calls, it's paying the rent, paying the heat, and paying salaries. Let me point out what is is that an alderman in the City of Chicago gets for precisely these same expenses: 33 thousand plus for the expenses of rent, utilities, telephone; 25 thousand plus for contractual employees; 138 thousand plus for regular salaried employees. We are looking, in that city, of aldermanic offices which serve far fewer constituents than we do, of nearly \$200 thousand. I would urge the Members this House that increasing the House amount to \$61 thousand, about 30% of what an alderman in the City of Chicago gets to run that operation, is hardly egregious, in fact, one could argue that it isn't nearly enough. I am sure that some will propose that this legislation is about lining our pockets, nothing could be further from the truth. This money is essential if we really are going to serve the constituents who ask for service from us. So, I

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

would hope that every Member of this House would be willing and able to stand up for the institution, and stand up for our responsibilities not only as lawmakers in Springfield, but as government officials serving the people in our districts. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to add a comment. And will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I don't know if you know, it's my understanding that the Senate gets their Springfield fax line paid for and installed, whereas in the House, we have to pay for that if we want it. Since everybody, basically, uses faxes, why isn't it that the House shouldn't be... have that paid for just from the general overall allotment rather than out of our district office allotment?"

Burke: "Representative, I don't know that that is, in fact, the case. I mean, on what authority do you have that understanding?"

Mulligan: "In the last... Each year that we move forward with technology, constituents that we represent expect us to be right up there in technology. I think there should be an allotment, also to help us with Internet providers, generally just technology, technology for the office down here, technology for the district office. Because of the vast expense for that, and the cost... you know, basically, when I look at my district office allotment I put money into the staff people there because the most important thing is constituent services. The people that they help and the quality of the person on the other end of the line, and particularly now, with the way employment is full employment, or at least it has been, it's harder and harder

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

to find a qualified person for the amount that we pay. And when it come to technology, I end up picking up a lot of that money either out of a campaign fund or out of my personal money. So, I think that we ought to take a look at, and I agree with what your Bill says, but I think we ought to take a look at... we don't pay any less than the Senate does for individual technology, yet they get a higher office allowances. In some instances, people feel more comfortable with us and we do the Senate's... you know, we do the majority of the Senator's constituent services if you have a good person at the other end of the I think that the fact that the Senate gets more, and that they get more and can pay for more in the area of technology should be made a little more equitable. although, what you're trying to do I certainly commend, because we have things we cannot keep up, the cost of living, and particularly, for people in the district I think technology allowances ought to be looked office. at again in the future, and that we ought to be given a larger allotment for that, because each year the price goes up. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1855, a Bill for an Act in relation to the General Assembly. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill is now on the Order of Third Reading.

And the Chair recognizes Mr. Burke."

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Burke: "Thank you again, Speaker. I think the previous speakers made the case very well that, indeed, we have the opportunity today to compliment and thank our staffs that manage our affairs at the district office, and certainly, we should not forget our staff here in Springfield as well. We all understand the increasing cost of doing business no matter in what arena, whether it be government or private industry. I think we would all agree that it's becoming more costly to operate an efficient office, and indeed, this legislation would begin to accommodate some of those concerns, and certainly, I would ask all the Members' favorable consideration, and vote 'aye' in favor of Senate Bill 1855. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there were 77 'ayes', 40 'noes'. Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hultgren, do you wish to call your House Resolution 916? Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention, this concerns our schedule for the day. We, in the House, have completed almost all of our work. We are now waiting for Senate action on certain Bills such as a possible pension Bill. The plan is for the House to stand at ease. I would recommend you go to lunch. We don't expect that we'll be coming back into Session anything earlier than 2 o'clock this afternoon. But, once you hit 2 o'clock you should be close to the chamber ready for a call to come back into Session, so the House shall stand at ease. The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed

134th Legislative Day

- January 9, 2001
- Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk. And if the Members of the Rules Committee would retire to the Speaker's Conference Room for a meeting of the Rules Committee, immediately. Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures were referred, action taken on January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' for House Resolution 981, House Resolution 986, House Resolution 972, and Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1707."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Clerk for an announcement."
- Clerk Bolin: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."
- Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 3841, Mr. Durkin.

  Mr. Durkin."
- Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask if you'd suspend the posting requirements of Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 3841."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the posting requirements to permit the immediate consideration of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 in committee. Is there leave? Leave is granted. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar #2, there appears Senate Bill 1707, Mr. Hoffman. Senate Bill 1707, Mr. Hoffman. The Chair recognizes Mr. Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Conference Committee #1 to Senate Bill 1707 deals with enterprise zones.

  Presently, in enterprise zones the sales tax credits for

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

building materials are only available if they are purchased within the county or the municipality where the enterprise zone is located. The primary purpose of Senate Bill 1707 expands the opportunity to purchase materials statewide in order to qualify for the sales tax exemption. The purpose for that is that in some communities the stores do not exist from which to purchase the materials, and therefore, the enterprise is not advantaged by the sales tax benefit. Another problem has been that sometimes storefronts are set up as almost sham companies to sell these to make available This Bill, I think, is a very the sales tax credit. reasonable way to address those problems, and I believe will work very well. The second portion of this Bill deals with the Metro East Mass Transit. It's an agreement between the Department of Revenue and the metro area mass transit district at the request of Representative Hoffman. And it clarifies some tax sharing information so that the mass transit district will be able to accurately do its business. With that I will ask for any questions, and ask for your approval."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leitch has moved that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1707. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1707?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1707. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Currie for a Motion."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the House adopt House Resolutions 972, 981, and 986. These have been reported favorably by the Rules Committee, and they are printed on the Calendar, as Supplemental #2, currently on your desks. I know of no opposition. The vote in the Rules Committee was unanimous."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the Resolutions listed on Supplemental Calendar #2. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And House Resolution 972, House Resolution 981, and House Resolution 986 are adopted.

  Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention, Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk for an announcement."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn
  Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which
  the following measures were referred, action taken on
  January 9th, 2001, reported the same back with the
  following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration'
  for House Bill 4267, referred to concurrence, approved for
  consideration. Supplemental Calendar #3 is being
  distributed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Supplemental Calendar #3, there appears House Bill 4267. The Chair recognizes Representative Rich Myers."
- Myers: "I move to waive the posting notice requirement."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the posting requirement for House Bill 4267. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Judiciary I Committee will meet in Room 114 immediately, and the House will stand at ease. So again,

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

the Judiciary I Committee will meet immediately in Room 114, and the House shall stand at ease. The House shall come to order. The Chair recognizes Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the At this time I'd like to recognize a colleague of ours who had the extreme privilege of working here in Springfield, Mr. Edgar Lopez. A man who served a term in the House of Representatives for eight years and he served his community well. Edgar came down here with ambitions and dreams for his community, and he fulfilled everyone, and accomplished everyone of those goals he wanted to do. And for that, his community is a better place. I'm not here to say goodbye to Edgar, but I'm here to let him know that you've built friendships here in Springfield, and those friendships will last forever. I want to wish you and your family the very best. I know there's great success ahead of you. And I know you... The man that you are, Edgar, you will accomplish those goals and you're gonna succeed in the future. I'd also like to say to the other colleagues who are leaving us here today, I wish you and your family the best of luck and I know you have great futures, great success stories ahead of you. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Speaker. I just want to add to what Eddie had to say in regards to Edgar Lopez. It's been a pleasure to sit here for the last two years next to Edgar. As a third termer, I certainly learned a lot from him and our friendship developed, but it was always interesting here, Speaker, too, to sit between the two Members of Leadership here, I felt like I was working a switchboard when their phone calls kept coming in. And it's a job I will certainly miss, Edgar, but like we all know, every dark

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

cloud has silver linings and you're destined for great things. For the two of you, Lopez's, we will miss you, we'll love you, but we'll see you. God bless you both."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. I too, am delighted to join in this Resolution congratulating Edgar Lopez, our aisle mate, our friend, our buddy. He saved me from a couple of major deals down here, and I will, indeed, miss his colleagueship, but I certainly won't miss his friendship, he's not going all that far away, particularly in the City of Chicago. So, Edgar, all the best to you. You know that we have the highest regard for you, and wish you nothing but the best in your future and maybe someday you'll come back."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Edgar, what can I say. Eight years you've been here and watching the aisle for us when we were absent from our seats here. You've done a great job with telling us what was going on half the time. Edgar always had the one sense that he knew what was going on at all times. And we're sorely going to miss you, Edgar, but I know you'll be back. God bless you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli, did you want to say anything about the departure of Mr. Bugielski?"

Unknown: "He's at a loss for words."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bugielski, did you want to say anything about your departure."

Bugielski: "No. I owe you one, now. I just walked in and I was downstairs at the time. So, just on the House Resolution on Edgar Lopez, it was an honor serving with Edgar here. It was great to have a Member of our row, we have a lot of fun in this row, and we're certainly gonna miss him, but I

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

know he will still be around to visit us. We wish him the best for we had great times together, many memories, and I'm sure he's gonna be around here many times to relive these memories. But, he may be out of the House, but he'll still be around. We wish him the best of luck and the best of health in the future years. Good luck."

- Speaker Madigan: "There are several people seeking recognition, and I would simply ask if those seeking recognition are seeking to address House Resolution 993, which is concerned with Mr. Lopez. So, Mr. Leitch, is that what you wish to speak to? Mr. Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's no Member for whom I have higher respect in the chamber than Edgar Lopez, and, Edgar, it's been a wonderful opportunity to get acquainted with you. It's been an even better opportunity to get acquainted with your lovely wife, Lilly, whom I see is joining you. You truly have a lot to offer, and like many of the others who've expressed themselves, I hope you're back soon."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford, did you wish to speak to 993?

  Mr. Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Edgar Lopez and I have had the chance to do a rather unique experience. And, Edgar, as you see the evolution of what's gonna happen south of Florida, and you see the day that normalization for Cuba starts to come to this country, and it will, we both know that, I want you to know that you had taken a significant part in helping Governor Ryan do what he did in the Country of Cuba. Ambassador Remirez sends his regards, wishes you the greatest. And, Edgar, I too, look forward to seeing you return here with us in Springfield."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Wojcik."

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Edgar, I just want to wish you lots of luck. You and I have worked together very closely, and we've had many a good conversation and some wonderful evenings and some nice times. And only the best to you and your family. And I am hoping that you're going to come back someday. So, God bless and enjoy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lopez. Mr. Lopez."

Lopez: "Well, it was kind of unexpected. First of all, thank you for all of those who have spoke on this Resolution. I want to thank all of you, everyone, for helping me represent my district well. You know, it's... we're always down here to do what's best for our communities, and all of you have played a part in making my district a better place to live. I want to especially thank those who served in the Roberto Clemente High School investigation because, no matter what happens, my district and my school is a better place today after the changes have been made as a result of the investigation. And regardless of what's happened politically, my district and my school is a better place today than it was three years ago. So a special thanks to all of you who served under tremendous pressures. But, thank you. Thank you again on behalf of my community and behalf of my wife and my family. Thank you. You have not seen the last of me. I will be around. I'll continue participating in issues that are important to people in my area and in the Hispanic community at large in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you and thank Governor Ryan. And God bless you all. And, we'll be around. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd just like to commend Representative Burke for being a lot more on the ball than

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

some of the rest of us were. So, on behalf of many of our other colleagues on this side of the aisle, I hope you will all join me in wishing the very best to one of... a number of our colleagues who are leaving today who we've really enjoyed working with and serving with. First of all, like to mention a good friend and a Class of '92 Member, and a terrific Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Beth Gash. We will miss you, Lauren. Wanda Sharp. Wanda Sharp is also going on to bigger and better things. Wanda, Sonia Silva. Larry Willard (sic-Woolard) will carry all of our Bills over in the Senate, so just make sure that... Larry promises to pass any of our Bills for us in the State And at least on our side of the aisle we have a bit of a problem with that. Thank you so much, Willis Harris and Coy Pugh are also going on to open new chapters in their life. And I know you will join all of us in wishing all of them the very best."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had or have three departing Members. I said had because one of our Members left earlier, and as in the Republican principles, we always send Members on to bigger and better things. Tim Johnson has gone to Congress, has been sworn in as a Congressman and serves us now in Washington, D.C. So, Tom, all the way in Washington... Tim, all the way in Washington and we want to thank you for all you've done, and congratulations to Tim Johnson for years of service in the General Assembly, and good luck in Washington, D.C. I know he'll hear your applause. Bill Brady has been an effective and good Member of the House Republican organization. We're delighted to have spent many, many years, I think, since 1993, well with Bill Brady here in the Illinois General Assembly. He

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

represents an area that thinks very, very highly of him, and we look forward to hearing many, many good things from Bill Brady in the future, as we know we will. Bill, good luck to you and your family, best wishes to you and thanks for being a part of our caucus that's serving the people of Illinois. Cal Skinner and I have served an legislative career together. He took a brief respite for awhile and came back, and I can tell you that no one in the General Assembly knows more about the tax structure, particular, the property tax structure than Cal Skinner. He's been an effective and important Member of our caucus, a valued friend, one that we've all looked to for advice in taxation matters. Cal, whatever your future may hold I know it will be excellent and one that you will speak very clearly and forcefully on your viewpoints. We want to congratulate you and thank you for being of service to people of Illinois for these many, many years. Cal Skinner, good luck to you. And, Mr. Speaker, those are our three Members."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was a Member on our side whose name was not mentioned, who I did wish to express, on behalf of the Body, all of our appreciation. That Member was Representative Mike Giglio, who followed in the footsteps of his father who was a Member of your Leadership team, Mr. Speaker, for many years. His father, Frank, represented the southern suburbs with great tenacity, and great compassion. And Mike not only followed in that very tradition but he blazed his own trail and was very conscientious about the issues, especially those that pertained to the daily lives, improving the daily lives of working men and women. So, on behalf of all of us, I would

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

want to extend my gratitude and appreciation, not just for the professional courtesies that were shown, but also for the friendship that was extended throughout the many hours that we shared together here in this Body. I'd like to close my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by adding one final personal I personally am going to miss many of the colleagues who have gone on to seek other challenges. particular I wish to share with you a few thoughts with, and I certainly hope I don't embarrass her. Representative Lauren Beth Gash has been someone who has stood beside me for many years in fighting some very difficult battles along the northshore. At a time when the northshore was really considered to be a one-party part of the world and it was not a Democratic part of the world, Lauren and I, nonetheless, sought to carve out a different way, a way that was reform oriented, a way that was thoughtful, a way that was intelligent, and we didn't always prevail, we weren't always right, and I think we'd be the first to admit to it, but it was whatever Lauren showed throughout her career, it wasn't without any lack of care, lack of commitment, lack of compassion for those, those who couldn't care for their own particularly interests all the time. And I know that all of us will feel some measure of sadness for those who are going on to seek other challenges that they won't be with us on a daily basis. But I just wanted to tell you that Lauren Beth Gash I found to have so many exemplary qualities, and while she and I worked together on things and didn't always see the same way as many of us don't always see the same way on how to achieve an objective or achieve a goal. I have met very few people in public service, Democrat or Republican, who put their heart into what they did to the extent that

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

Lauren Beth Gash has. And, Lauren, as your friend, and as your neighbor, and as your partner in crime, I want to, on behalf of everybody here, extend my best and certainly hope that you can continue to make the lives of so many people better as you have up until now. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On behalf of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, I would simply like to just express my appreciation for four of our Members who will be leaving, as was previously mentioned, Representative Willis Harris, Representative Coy Pugh, Representative Wanda Sharp, and Representative Sonia What's so special to me, and special with two of our Members, Representative Coy Pugh and Representative Wanda Sharp is that these individuals was a man and woman the cloth. They truly had a divine order about  $\circ f$ themselves. As Representative Sharp gave the invocation this morning, it represented a spirit of newness, it represented a spirit of godliness, it represented a spirit of righteousness that we should have in this Body. And we're truly gonna miss that. We're truly gonna miss someone that's gonna stand and debate the issues with you, but also, is going to express to you that we should do it the right way, and the righteous way. We're gonna miss that. I'm gonna miss Representative Coy Pugh who's a people that are Gentleman that truly stands for incarcerated, an individual that is incarcerated wrongly, and judged wrongly. We're gonna miss Representative Harris who truly has something encouraging to say to every Member that he had came for. He's truly gonna be missed. And, of course, Representative Sonia Silva who has a life of fight in her. She fights for her district. And that's truly

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

what we're all down here for. So, I would simply like to say that these individuals will go on to higher endeavors, but they will be missed. And even though we will have a new Body come to replace them, and we hope that that Body comes in with the same vigor and vitality as the Members that they preceded. So, I would just simply like to say that, they should be commended for the work that they have done for their districts in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #3, there appears

House Bill 4267. Mr. Rich Myers. Mr. Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4267, as amended, provides that panels of at least three instead of members of the Prison Review Board shall decide specified cases relating to prisoners. This Amendment corrects an error in drafting when the Prisoner Review Board was increased to 15 members in Senate Bill 1860. LRB went through the ACT and increased every number of members required to the ACT proportionately. This defeated the purpose of the increase in membership which was to reduce the strain on the current members. This increase is required... in required signatures for action could create a situation which prevents prisoners who are granted parole from being released immediately because signatures are being chased down. And at this point in time, there's no known opposition to this Amendment. I respectfully, request passage of the Amendment and the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4267. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4267?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those

134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4267. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going back to House Resolution 993, which was concerned with Representative Edgar Lopez, and on that Resolution, Mr. Burke moves that the House do adopt House Resolution 993. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 993 is adopted. Representative Hannig. Mr. Hannig."

- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the approval of House Journals #1 through #132. The Journal Review Committee has examined the Journals and requests that they be approved. This has been examined by both sides of the aisle. So, I would move the we approve House Journals #1 through House Journals #132."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Mr. Hannig's Motion is adopted. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. The Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know you're prepared to adjourn sine die which brings to a close another legislative Session, being the 91st Session. On behalf of House Republicans, I want to thank all Members of the General Assembly, Democrats and Republicans alike, for your tremendous spirit of cooperation, and yes, your dedication to your principles. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your help over the past two years. Of course, there would be a few things we wish you had changed a little bit, but that being the case, we still had many areas of accomplishments: from the area of senior tax

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

relief and prescription drugs, to continued improvement in education funding and school construction grants, to the area dealing with Illinois First and the improvement of funding on those levels. There are many areas that we can be very proud of in accomplishments. On behalf of House Republicans, I want to thank a staff that I think worked extremely hard for Republican Members of the General Assembly, and who put in innumerable and countless hours to serve the people of Illinois. So, let me offer my thanks to a great staff, many of whom have gone on, as you know, to other areas whether it's Congress or otherwhere, and now joined by a former Member, in Bob Churchill, who we are will help forge our relationship into the 92nd General So, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my thanks for your help over the years and the accomplishments of the 91st General Assembly. We look forward to tomorrow to a new legislative Session, congratulations to you, Sir. I'm advised that I'm suppose to make a Motion to adjourn sine die."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels has moved that the House adjourn sine die. Before we take the Motion, I would like to thank all of the Members of the House, and of course, in particular, the Democratic Members and all staff on both sides of the aisle, and in particular, the Democratic Staff for the fine work and dedication that all of you have given to this particular Session of the General Assembly. We've all been here long enough to know that this is a slow and laborious process, very difficult to show specific achievement in any one particular time, but we also know that over time given a good level of dedication and belief in the process, change can be accomplished for the better. And so, for all of that I wish to thank you very, very

#### 134th Legislative Day

January 9, 2001

much. Have a good evening. Come here refreshed tomorrow morning for those of you who are returning so that you can enjoy the festivities. So, on Mr. Daniels' Motion, those in favor of adjourning sine die say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. This Session of the General Assembly is hereby declared adjourned sine die."