93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Vernon Lyons of the Ashburn Baptist Church in Orland Park. Pastor Lyons is the guest of Representative Kosel. The guests in the gallery my wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Lyons: "Let us pray. Lord, You know we really didn't come here to pray, nevertheless, we truly need Your help. We are in awe of Your goodness and Your glory. We are amazed at Your might and Your majesty. And though You control the universe, yet You know each one of us and You love each one And we are amazed that knowing us, You love us. And we come today, some of us, with burdens. Someone here, Lord, with an aging parent that has become a problem. Another over here with a rebelling teen that is more than a handful. Another recently has lost a dear one. Another of our number, Lord, has come from the doctor with a report that's not good. Either lighten the load, we ask, or give the strength to bear it. And we thank You that You have loved us so much that You have given Your son, Jesus Christ, to die for our sins, that through Him, we might have full forgiveness and life that is everlasting. Help us, we pray, as we do our task here to put people above party. Principle above politics. Give wisdom that we might know what is right and courage to do what is right. And we ask all these mercies in the glorious name of Jesus, Your son, our Saviour. Amen."

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

Hartke - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

for all."

- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that we have no excused House Democrat today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe. Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show today that Representative Black is excused, and Representative Hassert, and I'd probably like for all the Representatives to keep Representative Hassert in their prayers this weekend. He's at Northwestern University under consultation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady."

- Brady: "Mr. Speaker, will you please let the record reflect that I'm here. My key isn't working."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins. We're on Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115 people responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Biggins. Mr. Biggins."
- Biggins: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just had the unfortunate experience of attending... participating in an Aging Committee, hearing of a very important Bill. In fact, the Bill's Sponsor, Representative Franks, said, 'The most important Bill this General Assembly.' The most important Bill, Mr. Franks presented down there in Aging, and we were suppose to be able to ask questions of the Sponsor and his coterie of television camera posees that were sitting all around him and behind him for his commercial for his reelection up in McHenry County. But we weren't allowed to ask those questions, even though the Chair promised us that we would be able to ask those questions, told us by name, including myself and others, that we would be allowed to ask questions of the Sponsor.

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Then, because of our extremely busy schedule here, we all of a sudden had to adjourn, and we didn't get to make our points or ask any questions of the Sponsor on his most important Bill of this General Assembly. Course, yesterday, in the Executive Committee, he didn't have the most important Bill. Well, it may have been to some people, some people, Representative Franks thought, were going to introduce a Bill that would take ATMs off the riverboats. But when the Bill came up for committee yesterday, Representative Franks put in a Bill that kept them on the riverboats, much to the disappointment of those who are opposed to their being on the riverboats and different from what Mr. Franks had previously promised them. So, today, he follows up with a Bill, get this, free medical care. How's that grab ya? And, what department's gonna handle it? By his own... by the testimony of the Department of Revenue, nobody's gonna handle this. Nobody's equipped to handle it. The most important Bill of this General Assembly, and Mr. Franks does not even know how it's gonna be administered. And, maybe he would have had more time to look this up in his deep deliberations, if he'd spent more... but 24 hours looking at the Bill. were not given the Bill until 24 hours ago. important Bill of this General Assembly, Franks' Bill. important as ATMs off the boats, no, those people, they can be disappointed. How about the seniors that are looking for this care. How about the Republican proposal? No, Franks wouldn't allow that. So, all the people in the room, if you enjoy television commercials..."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Biggins: "...they'll be in one."

Speaker Madigan: "Please give your attention to Mr. Biggins."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Biggins: "All the people in the commercial... All the people that that room could be in Franks' television were in commercial. Instead of getting medicines, they're gonna be on television. That's cruel, Mr. Franks. It's not what you've been sent here to do. That's not what this Body's suppose to do. That's not an open debate. It's a very cruel thing to do to our senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, could it be possible to reconvene the Aging Committee after we adjourn? Upon adjournment today. I suppose it'll be close to seven or eight o'clock tonight, huh? Well, I'll be here to wait. If it's eight o'clock, I'll be here. it's midnight, I'll be here. And we'll go back to the Aging Committee, we'll reconvene, we'll get those seniors back in the room and they can hear the full debate on the Bill. Mr. Speaker. Would you please reconvene the Aging Committee upon adjournment today, Sir?"

Speaker Madigan: "Let me consult with the Chair and the Members of the Committee, Mr. Biggins. Mr. Turner, John Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have a tremendous amount of respect for you. But what Representative Biggins just indicated to you, is 100% accurate. I was on the Aging Committee, and we started just a little bit late, and Representative Franks did submit a Bill, and he did lead off by saying it was the most important Bill that we would hear during this Session. He then presented it and put on his proponents. I suggested to the Chair about, oh, five minutes until one, that there was no possible way we could possibly get through all of the testimony and allow all the Members of the Committee to ask questions. And he said he would give us 15 more minutes and he would cover everything. And even when he said it, it was obvious that that was not going to

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

happen. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the reason was why the Bill had to absolutely, unequivocally, be moved through Committee today without giving it a fair chance to be heard and questions to be asked by all the Members of the Committee. My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, I've heard you many times stand up and say you've been deprived of your rights. Maybe you don't care, but Representative Franks had an opportunity to take the Bill out of the record, after saying it was the most important Bill we were going to hear. I was promised by the Chairman, I would have an opportunity to ask some questions. I was deprived of that opportunity, as about six other Members. When the opponents of the Bill started to put on their particular testimony, they were cut off. Again, I don't know why this is being done. Session has been run very fair up to this juncture, but for some unknown reason in Committee today, in the Aging Committee, the Minority Party was not afforded the opportunity to ask questions. We couldn't even determine if we were for the Bill or against the Bill, 'cause we couldn't even ask questions concerning the Bill. totally unfair. It was a complete deprivation of due process, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that you will do something to address what happened in Committee today, because it was without any question, one of the most unfair things I've seen since 1994 when I first arrived on the scene in the General Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "(Who needs all this bullshit?) Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Fritchey: "On a much less controversial note, I'm happy to say

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

that one of our newer Members is celebrating her 50th birthday tomorrow. And in her bipartisan spirit, I welcome everybody on both sides of the aisle to come over and have some cookies and join us in wishing Susan Garrett a happy 50th birthday."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, was in the Aging Committee today, and unfortunately it doesn't seem to me that what I've heard was exactly what occurred. If you look at what happened, there are 80 proponents who signed slips. Eighty proponents. Forty-nine organizations, 31 individuals, three opponents, seven requested to testify, and two on each side got to testify. Now, we've all been here a long time. A lot of us have been here a long time. Now, we don't wanna go back and start talking about what happened between 1994, 1995, and 1996. We don't wanna talk about that. We think that this should be one of the biggest bipartisan, across the aisles... across the aisles, support of Bills that this General Assembly has ever seen. We're talking about senior citizens and ensuring, ensuring that they have prescription drugs at a reasonable price. Now, I know... I know Chairman McGuire, and you know Chairman McGuire, and there's no fairer Representative on this House Floor than Chairman McGuire. And I respect the previous speakers as well as I respect Mr. McGuire. when you say that, what went on in the Aging Committee today, I think you are directly, directly calling his credibility in suspect. And I want to tell ya, Jack McGuire is one heck of a Chairman, one of the fairest Chairman, and he ran that with dignity and I think that you should take it back."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Daniels: "Well, you can give all the speeches you want about cooperation, but when you ignore Members' rights and you refuse to allow Republicans to speak on a very important issue like this, you're ignoring the very Constitution, the very effort that we have to represent all people in Illinois. You talk about helping the senior citizens. do you help them when you set back their efforts to meaningful relief and pharmaceutical relief? How do you help them when you spend a billion dollars of taxpayers' money in your first Bill, and then a billion dollars from the manufacturers that you know and I know, we can't do in this state. You're pandering once again. You're pandering and you're going out there and you're trying to rev up senior citizens, when you know that the Bill you have Mr. Speaker, you are in charge of an before won't work. orderly operation in this chamber. Up till this time, you've done a very effective job, and we compliment it. But when you and your majority denies the opportunity for Republicans to speak on behalf of senior citizens on a Bill that will work, a Bill in that state that will make a difference on circuit breaker relief, not one phoney effort like the Sponsor of this Bill brings out where he's offering promises that he can't deliver on, you are... you are then turning your back on Illinois and the citizens of this state. It's a shame, it's a sham that you're pulling right now. You need to reconvene this Committee. You need to allow Republicans to speak. You need to hear our alternative proposal that will work, an alternative proposal that deals with circuit breaker relief, now. deals with increasing the circuit breaker for seniors, now! That increases the opportunity for every senior citizen in this state to get relief, now! And I'm sick and tired of

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

your ramroding these things through the General Assembly. The day is over. The day is over when you're gonna do this to us once again. And if it means an end to cooperation, an end to this laying down and letting you roll us over, it's over for you. And unless you reconvene this Committee and allow people to speak in a democratic way, we are gonna stand in its way. Look at this monster that'll you're proposing to the State of Illinois. Look at this chart. That's what this Bill does. Look at this. This is the Hillary Clinton/Jack Franks Bill that is a health care phoney Bill today in Illinois. Look at this, a billion dollar cost to Illinois, a billion dollar cost manufacturers. It's phoney. It won't work. You know it won't work, and that's why our alternative proposal, which we're gonna speak about. You won't let us speak in Committee; we're going to the Blue Room after Session. We're gonna tell the people of Illinois the kind of program that will work that the Governor could sign and get behind, and you should get behind it, instead of your phoney talk about bipartisan stuff. You're ridiculous. give a plan that will work, and I predict the plan that we propose today is that one that will be passed. And every Republican is gonna stand strong on it. So, we're tired of this, and it's not gonna happen anymore."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. I certainly want to work together bipartisanly for the best Bill we can create. Now, the statements that you made, Mr. Daniels, are patently incorrect. And I am so confident that after we talk about this, that it's gonna pass, that I want to make a Motion on

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

my own to recommit this back to Committee. Let's do it next week and it'll pass again."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. The Motion is to recommit the Bill to Committee to permit a committee hearing next week. The Speaker's Office will advise the Chair to set aside as many hours as are needed. Eight to ten to twelve to fourteen, to completely hear the Bill. Those in favor of the Motion say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. The Bill is back in Committee. The Bill will be heard next week. And everyone can go to the Committee and work very straightforward and assiduously to work on the Bill. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would respectfully request the Chair to reconsider that... Somewhat like the Bill this afternoon in Committee, it just rammed that Motion down our There are committee people here ready to go throats. today. There are witnesses here from out of town. Your own rules provide... your own rules provide that out of town witnesses have a right to testify. Ιf mistaken, there were approximately 30 people here today in opposition that wanted to testify on this Bill. The people of the State of Illinois are gonna need a Valium paid for by the State of Illinois if you run this Bill through. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, if you would reconvene this Committee for this afternoon, we're ready to proceed. And I'd appreciate ..... just know their intentions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, what a day. We had an hour and a half, which was originally a 60 minute hearing, which started late, of course, because we didn't have a quorum. If anybody was cut off, they were cut off on both

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

sides of the aisles, and only because of the clock. There was no one treated any better or any worse than anyone And if you wanna tell the truth, I don't care which side of the aisle you're on, that's the way it was. no problem with reconvening, but I was there to run the Committee, and as I mentioned to Beth Coulson, I'm trying to run the Committee in the best, fair, impartial way I Anyone got to talk. Let me tell you, there were can. three opponents. Representative Cross, pay attention, Tom. Three opponents; 80 proponents. We gave two on each side, plus the Members. We had to cut the Members off with about six Members still on the docket. John, I don't promise that you can speak. I say you can speak if we don't run out of time. So, I think that's the way everybody runs a Committee. It's not a promise. I put your name down; you're next on the list. If we run out of time, we run out of time. It wasn't because it was John Turner or a Republican. We had Democrats who didn't get to speak. I just want to say I try to do the best I can, and if you don't like it, I'm very sorry about that. But, I try to do the best I can, and we'll reconvene if that's your desire." Speaker Madigan: "All right, the Chair of the Committee has announced that the Committee will reconvene immediately after Session. And, Mr. McGuire, the Chair will entertain

McGuire: "Yes. So moved."

particular Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "So, there's a Motion to suspend the posting requirement on that particular Bill. On that Motion, is there agreement? Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Committee will reconvene after Session. The posting requirements have

a Motion to suspend the posting requirements for that

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

been suspended. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Crotty."

- Crotty: "Thank you, Speaker. I have consulted with the minority spokesman... person for Children and Youth, and it's perfectly all right with her, so at this time, I would move to suspend the posting requirements on House Bill 2947, so that I can have it heard in Children and Youth on Tuesday."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has moved to suspend the posting requirements to permit the hearing of a Bill on Tuesday.

  Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. Representative Currie, for the same purpose on two other Bills."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move that we suspend the posting requirements so that House Bill 4404 may be heard next week in the Committee on Agriculture and House Bill 3936 in the Committee on Transportation. I know of no opposition to the Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the suspension of the posting requirements and... Representative Zickus."
- Zickus: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request the same for House Bill 4067, which is scheduled for the Agriculture Committee on Tuesday. I did check with the Chairman."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Zickus, could you wait just one minute? On the Currie Motion, the Chair recognizes Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just real quick, if we can confirm that our side has been consulted on her Motion.

  I'm not standing in opposition. I'd like to know if we can slow this down a bit."
- Speaker Madigan: "Yeah, Representative Currie, have you spoken to anybody on the Republican side?"

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Currie: "Yes, the minority spokesmen on both Committees have been consulted and were agreeable."

Speaker Madigan: "And which Committees would that be?"

Currie: "The Agriculture and Transportation."

Speaker Madigan: "Agriculture and Transportation."

Cross: "We're checking."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross, we'll hold that Motion for a minute.

We'll recognize Mr. Fritchey. Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to table House Bill 4274."

Speaker Madigan: "Are you the principal Sponsor?"

Fritchey: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table the Bill. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill is tabled. Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to table House Bill 3107."

Speaker Madigan: "Are you the principal Sponsor?"

Giglio: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table the Bill. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill is tabled.

Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table House Bill 3539."

Speaker Madigan: "Are you the principal Sponsor?"

Lindner: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves to table the Bill. Is there leave? Leave is granted, and the Bill is spon... Bill is tabled. Mr. Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table House Bill 4286. 4-2-8-6."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner, are you the principal Sponsor?"

Turner, J.: "I am, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. Is there leave?

Leave is granted. The Bill is tabled. Representative

Zickus. The Chair has been advised that on your Bill 4067,

that that's already posted for next week. Thank you. Back
to the Currie Motion. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "We're fine with that Motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves to suspend posting requirements for two Bills. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. On the Order of House Bills - Second Reading, there appears House Bill 298. Representative Do you wish to call the Bill? The Lady Feigenholtz. indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 665, Mr. Brunsvold. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 1459, Mr. Granberg. The Gentleman not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 1544, Representative Silva. The Lady does not wish to call the House Bill 1776, Representative Hamos. The Lady Bill. does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 2880, Mr. Bill Bill Mitchell. Does the Gentleman wish to call Mitchell. the Bill? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 2924, Mr. Fritchey. Fritchey. you wish to call the Bill? Mr. Fritchey does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 2958, Representative Garrett. Representative Garrett. Do you wish to call the Bill? The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 2962, Representative Flowers. House Bill 2993. That matter shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3007, Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke, 3007. Do you wish to call the Bill? It's concerned with predatory home loan practices. You want to leave it on Second Reading? Mr. Burke."

Burke: "I would ask the Bill remain on Second."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3009, Mr. Novak. Mr. Novak, Mr. Novak. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Is Mr. Novak in the chamber? Mr. Novak, you have House Bill 3009. Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Novak, what about the next one, 3027? The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3053, Representative Kosel. Lady does not with to call the Bill. 3117. The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. 3205, Mr. Delgado. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3286, Mr. Persico. The Gentleman does not with to call the Bill. House Bill 3288, Representative Cowlishaw. 3288. concerned with inner scholastic organizations. does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill Representative John Jones. Mr. John Jones. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk. Mr. John Jones."

Jones, J.: "Mr. Speaker, it's on Second right now."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you want to leave it on Second or..."

Jones, J.: "No, move it to Third."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, please be advised that the scoreboard and probably your computer screens are in a temporary breakdown. Now, we're only going to move a Bill from Second to Third Reading, so it's not the end of the world. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? 3293."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3293, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Community Development Finance Corporation Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens. Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in reference to your recent

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

comments in response to John Jones, you called it the 'scoreboard'. And I... I don't know, we always called it kind of the 'board'. And I wondered if it was a scoreboard, today, are we winning?"

Speaker Madigan: "Who's we?"

Stephens: "Well, it depends on whether my Bill's up or not whether... how we define 'we'."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, now on..."

Stephens: "I hope you're with us, Speaker."

- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. You got it. On 3293, Mr. Clerk, move that Bill to Third Reading. 3315, Mr. Delgado. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3408.

  Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? That's 3406."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3406, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments, no Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On 3420, the Sponsor does not wish to move the Bill. 3426, Representative Slone. Do you wish to call the Bill? The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3464, Mr. Jerry Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3464, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments, no Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3482, Representative Hamos. Hamos, 3482. Amends the Procurement Code. Do you wish to move the Bill? Representative, the Floor Amendment has not yet been approved by the Rules Committee. House Bill 3538, Mr. Righter. Mr. Righter. The Gentleman does now wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3840, Representative

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Currie. The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3841, Mr. Durkin. Mr. Durkin, 3841. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3854, Representative Fowler. Mr. Fowler. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. 3901, Mr. Fowler? 3901. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 4021, Representative Coulson. The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 4144, Mr. Lopez. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4144, a Bill for an Act in relation to condominiums. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments, no Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading. Representative Cowlishaw, do you wish to call 709? House Bill 2915, Mr. Righter. Mr. Righter does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3032, Mr. Winters. Is Mr. Winters in the chamber? Do you wish to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3032, a Bill for an Act creating the Midwest Interstate Passenger Rail Compact. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3032 sets up an interstate compact between 11 midwestern states. The basic purpose of this is to lobby on behalf of the midwestern region before Amtrak and before Congress. Now that the northeast quarter is fully developed, the six billion dollars of federal money that had gone into that is no longer needed. We want to make sure that Chicago, as the hub of the Midwest high speed rail network, will move forward and be the first priority of the federal

93rd Legislative Day February 10, 2000 authorities. This forms a compact upon three other state... two other states, excuse me, a total of three

states passing identical language. I would be happy to

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. John Turner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I didn't get a chance to ask any questions on the Bill I really wanted to ask questions on, so I'm just going to ask questions on your Bill instead. It's kind of a substitute. You don't know anything about Representative Franks' Bill do you?"

Winters: "It's not part of this Bill, no."

answer any questions."

Turner, J.: "Oh, it's not part of the Bill. Well, in all seriousness, I'm not familiar with your Bill, but I heard you mention high speed rail. Obviously, therefore, your Bill has something to do with that. Could you very quickly tell me again what it does with regard to high speed rail? Because that is a concern in my district. I have a lot of folks very wary of the high speed rail coming through the farm ground in my district."

Winters: "Right. This is an initiative of the Council of State Governments Midwest Legislative Council. A number of Legislators from other states have worked together on this. There is significant funding going into this. Governor Ryan, under Illinois First last year, did put \$70,000,000 to upgrade crossings, to upgrade the rails. We anticipate, for instance, the first segment that will probably be brought up to higher speed traffic, we'll move it from a maximum of 78 miles an hour, which Amtrak now can run on some downstate segments, that maximum speed would go to a

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

110 miles an hour. It includes the purchase of about 40 new train sets. Those will be constructed in the Midwest, and probably in Chicago. It will employ several thousand railway workers as they upgrade these rail crossings. of these before we actually run the trains, we're looking a three to five year time frame before we really are running that major segment from Chicago to St. Louis. of the crossings that will be maintained will have a positive means of keeping traffic from going around the gates. In other words, they'll either have the cable restraints or they've have four gates. IDOT has already said that in most of the downstate communities, they will be looking at some type of cyclone fencing on both sides of the railroad right-of-way to keep the adolescents, people that might take a shortcut across the railroad tracks, to keep them off there and add an actual crossing where they would have a signal when the gates go down, that's there's going to be a train coming through fairly quickly. The frequency of travel today is about, I believe, four trains a day between Chicago and St. Louis. That would move up to It will have a much more reliable service, ten per day. one that would offer many more options for an alternative to the... to air traffic."

Turner, J.: "Is there an appropriation of any kind or any funding
in the Bill, any cost to the state?"

Winters: "This Bill itself is for a compact, which simply means there are four appointees by the Governor to... from each state that would meet at least annually and then would basically coordinate the lobbying effort before Congress, trying to give us a greater weight then just the Illinois delegation, but bring in the other states that are also interested in high speed rail. The only cost to this would

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

be of those four members from Illinois who would be going to an annual meeting, a relatively minor cost that IDOT is prepared to pick up; so, there's no separate appropriation."

Turner, J.: "The... the main concern that is raised in my district is that it... This high speed rail, if completed, would require shutting down many intersections that are used, not only in rural areas, but also within some of the smaller towns. Is it your intention for the Commission to study that particular question, and how we might resolve that very big issue in rural Illinois?"

Winters: "The Commission itself is really simply an advocacy We took out language that was in there initially that would allow them to review plans, to get much more involved in the administration of high speed rail development. So, the compact as it is in this Bill is really just an advocacy role. I do know that IDOT, in their testimony and in talking to me, they seem to think that much of the concern about rail closings, that they were upgrading a lot of these closings so... crossings, so that they would be able to stay open, that there would be additional money to keep more crossings open than they had initially anticipated. And that, particularly working with the Farm Bureau, I think that's the organization that's taken the biggest lead, they seem to have answered much of the Farm Bureau's questions. can't speak for Farm Bureau. They did not testify against this."

Turner, J.: "Okay, yes, and I think a minute ago, I said intersections. I meant crossings."

Winters: "Right."

Turner, J.: "Thanks for clarifying that. I guess my last

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

question is, it's my belief, although I could be wrong, that most of my district probably opposes. I know that's not what you want to hear, but probably opposes the high speed rail. But... would my vote for your Bill be construed as a vote for high speed rail?"

Winters: "You can construe it however you wish, I think, John."

Turner, J.: "How would..."

Winters: "I would say..."

Turner, J.: "...you construe it, Representative?"

Winters: "I would say that Senator Maitland has expressed interest in being a Sponsor of this in the Senate."

Turner, J.: "Okay, thanks for answering my questions."

Winters: "Certainly."

Turner, J.: "I appreciate it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Who's talking?"

Moffitt: "I don't... I don't believe this question was asked. Do you anticipate many crossings being closed? That's what I was... especially downstate. Now, you talked about how they would be upgraded in the Committee. But if this goes to the full extent, are we gonna see crossing closures in downstate?"

Winters: "I think that there will be some, but I am not... That has not been part of the discussion to this point. That's more of a one between Amtrak, IDOT and probably the Farm Bureau is the major interest group interested in it. I'm not aware of where those discussions are at this point. But, I don't believe that as nearly as controversial, the latest negotiations have kind of led most parties to think

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

that they're going to be able to reach an accommodation on the number of crossing closings."

Moffitt: "And did you say that Farm Bureau had not taken a position on this?"

Winters: "They did not... They did not submit a slip during the committee testimony."

Moffitt: "And were there any other opponents?"

Winters: "No."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryder."

I think that there's Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. important distinction on this Bill that we need understand. I share the same concerns that other speakers have indicated about what it's going to mean to district that I represent, as do you, for crossings and other items. What we are suggesting in this piece of legislation is that we want to be part of the group that's going to be making decisions about passenger rail, that we want to be part of a compact of the midwestern states that are concerned about passenger rail, especially high speed rail, and that we want to be able to access the dollars that are available. And maybe by participating in this compact, we'll be able to access the dollars to keep open even more of those crossings that we're concerned about, than if we do not participate. If we're shut out by our own vote, then we only have ourselves to blame when others make decisions for the State of Illinois. I'd rather be in the compact, working to accommodate our needs, than having someone else make that decision. Voting for this means that we're part of the decision makers and we can attempt to accommodate our own needs. If you vote against it, then you're left without a voice as to who will ultimately be

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

able to make those decisions that affect your district. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we ought to express our gratitude to the Council of State Governments, which as you know has a midwestern division with an office in Lombard, The Council of State Governments established a Illinois. task force to look at the whole subject of a midwestern approach to rail transportation. I have been associated with that task force now for about three years, and the Chairman is a very fine state Senator from one of our adjoining states. And she actually came here and held a meeting with those of us in Illinois who serve on this... on this task force. Seems to me that the only thing that... There's a question that has been raised that seems to be a concern to people who hadn't really studied this issue particularly well, but were simply trying to get a general idea is, is this something that is being proposed an alternative to air travel? And the answer is, no. In the midwest, we are going to need all of the air and rail transportation combination, along with our highways and all the rest of the forms of transportation. need to do is take all of those things and combine them in a way that works the best for the largest number of people that is the most affordable. So, I urge all of you to vote in favor of this Bill, and I also think it is important for us to recognize the contribution that has been made by the Council of State Governments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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?

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? person has not voted. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 people voting 'yes', 4 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3046, Mr. Saviano. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3119, Representative Coulson. The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3180, Mr. Durkin. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3236, Mr. Lang. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3256, Mr. Novak. Mr. Novak. The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3355. The Chair is advised that the Sponsor is waiting for an Amendment. House Bill 3398, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3398, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3398 will allow for quality... a quality incentive for quality indicators being used in long term care. This program, which is a nationally recognized program and accredited, sets forward the guidelines that are to be followed by our long term care and care facilities. And, it's a database that will allow providers to use these indicators to identify potential presence or absence of poor care practices or outcomes, such as infectious control, clinical management, cognitive patterns and physical function. So, what this does, is if a long term care facility is going to go ahead, make the investment to offer a higher level of... than just the minimum standards that are out there that have been checked

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

by regulators, then it will offer a 50¢ per bed increase. And the amounts as far as the dollars concerned on this, if we had... In a perfect world, we would have full compliance with it, which would cost about \$11,000,000. Realistically, we're looking at about \$3,000,000. So about 20% would probably be a high for the facilities that would institute these software and database systems. That number is reimbursable at a 50% rate. So, cost of Illinois is between 1 and 1.5 million dollars. To be able to encourage the facilities that we entrust with our seniors and disabled, those in need of care, with an incentive to go beyond the standards, which prior to this time, have been basically set by government regulators coming in and doing surveys a couple of times a year. It encourages ongoing, striving to improve the quality of care. And I would simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, looking through our file, it appears that DHS and the Department of Public Health are both opposed to this Bill, at least at one time they were. To the best of your knowledge, are they still opposed?"

Mautino: "They're currently still opposed to the Bill. One of the questions, which was brought up there, was about the amount of the appropriation. And I believe that in the new budget, there's about \$70 million increase for long term care. So, I think the money can be found. A second thing that was brought up, is there was a program prior to this called QUIP, which basically gave incentives or added... added bonuses to long term care providers that would go forward and do other programs, but it was much more

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

subjective. You could actually receive incentive dollars if you wallpapered the bathroom; whereas, this one uses standards that are set forward by the University of Wisconsin, and they're nationally recognized. Little bit easier to track."

Cross: "I... Frank, I apologize. I'm not sure... My next question, maybe you just tried to answer this, and it's a little difficult to hear. The other concern, not only from the monetary standpoint... was what..."

Mautino: "Okay, the other one... The other second concern, and I apologize, the noise in the chamber is a little bit loud today. But, the other concern was, how do you follow and track? That's one of the bet... track. Who is qualifying? Who is meeting the standards? That's the nice thing about using a QI Program, is that you have actual, quantifiable standards, and this is nationally recognized. It was designed by the University of Wisconsin. So, now you can, instead of judging cosmetic changes or being very subjective as we were in the past, you have data that we can go ahead and use for making life better for those patients who will be there through the end of their lives."

Cross: "So, but... but I'm still... Frank, there's still... I think the biggest concern is... and I think maybe you tried to address it. What is the definition of a 'nationally recognized improvement program'? Is there... is there... is there a concern, because you haven't defined that in your Bill? Or I guess..."

Mautino: "Well..."

Cross: "... there is a concern. How do you handle that?"

Mautino: "Okay, sure. The... This one here, as a matter of fact, is... Congress mandated the use of standardized assessment instruments, which were RAIs for the facilities. And then

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

they would have to go and be approved before the Health Care Financing Administration, otherwise know as HCFA. So, the program that was developed by the University of Wisconsin is accredited. So, I would have to say, there are... there are standards inside that... inside the program itself. And I believe that that's... that's the question that we had in Committee. So, we would be using only a program like this one, which has been accredited and has objective standards."

Cross: "Going back to the money a second, Frank. I don't know that... and I can't speak for everybody on this side of the aisle, I don't know if people have any concerns with it. But I do think there's some... There might be some wisdom at least waiting awhile to see if we could determine the fiscal impact to this Bill. And I know you... We all have only... We have three Bills that we can move. I just wonder if there's a way..."

Mautino: "Actually..."

Cross: "Do you have any idea what the cost of this would be?"

Mautino: "Pardon me? I didn't hear ya. What?"

Cross: "No one seems to know what the fiscal impact is."

Mautino: "Oh."

Cross: "We know that, for instance, that Representative Franks'
Bill is gonna cost a billion dollars."

Mautino: "It is getting close to election time. Understood."

Cross: "Jack's, the one... that pharmaceutical Bill, the billion dollar Bill by Jack Franks. But we don't know what your Bill's gonna cost..."

Mautino: "Actually, we do..."

Cross: "...and I think we'd just like to know."

Mautino: "... because it was stated by the Department of Public Aid and Human Services. They were in agreement with the

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

numbers presented at Committee. If we use the 50¢ per day on all the beds throughout that are occupied, if every nursing home were to put in this system, it would cost \$11 million. The reality is that between 10 and 20% will probably make the investment for the computerized system and databases, and with that, your cost goes to \$3 million, which is what the department agreed to in Committee. if you take a look, that is 50% reimbursable. That is why, in my opening statement, I said the cost of this program, to the State of Illinois, would be between 1 million and 1.5 million, and that was agreed to and concurred with by the Department in Committee yesterday. So, we do know that the cost range is gonna be there. I would like to see more utilization, but the reality is, 10 to 20% of facilities out there will go ahead and make the investment for the software and databases that run this system."

Cross: "But, you can say it without any hesitation, that your Bill will not cost \$1 billion like Representative Franks'?"

Mautino: "Oh, I can say without any hesitation."

Cross: "All right."

Mautino: "As a fact, it's..."

Cross: "Thank you."

Mautino: "I'm kind of proud of the Sponsors up there. This is a bipartisan Bill. We have Representative Mitchell..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "...and Lyons."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "They're joining with us."

Mautino: "Yeah."

Speaker Madigan: "I think we're ready for a Roll Call."

Mautino: "Cool. Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "So, those in favor signify by voting 'yes';

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

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', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3476. Representative Julie Curry. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3476, a Bill for an Act amending the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3476 is a rather simple Bill. It amends the Motor Fuel Tax Law to allow pedestrian crossings to be funded under the Grade Crossing Protection Fund. This issue was brought to my attention last year when a community in my district in the southwest corner of Champaign County, which railroad crossings going east and west through their community and north and south, where trains were blocking the crossings for more than thirty minutes at a time in the mornings, and children were unable to get to the schools in which they went to school at there. And they were literally taking their bikes and going under the trains to get across the tracks. When we found out how expensive it would be to install pedestrian crossings either over the tracks or under the tracks, we quickly found out that it would be financially unfeasible for communities to be able to afford this, and we also found out through the I.C.C. that pedestrian crossings were not included in the road grade... or Grade Crossing Protection Fund. So this simply adds pedestrian crossings to that Program to be funded, and I'd ask that this Body support that. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Turner."

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

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Turner, J.: "Representative, it's hard to hear everything that you said, but is there a formula for how much money you're going to be taking from the Road Fund for the improvements you're talking about, or is it a percentage? Could you explain that?"

Curry: "The Illinois Commerce Commission is set by, I believe by rule, the amount of money that they use from that Fund to fund crossing upgrades. And I was told yesterday that it was \$9 million, but at some points in time they have exceeded that amount."

Turner, J.: "All right. Some of the staff over here seem to recall, you said you would amend this and made that pledge in Committee before you brought it to Third Reading."

Curry: "I don't think that that's true."

Turner, J.: "I don't know; obviously, I wasn't on the Committee."

Curry: "No, I don't think that's true."

Turner, J.: "Is that incorrect?"

Curry: "That's incorrect."

Turner, J.: "Okay, well, I won't further broach that subject then. So how much money is coming out of the Road Fund that would have otherwise been there that's going for the improvement that you're talking about in your Bill? Was it 9 billion or 9 million? I couldn't hear what you said."

Curry: "I thought it was 9 million."

Turner, J.: "Nine million dollars in total? Now, is that on an annual basis or is that..."

Curry: "It's a monthly basis."

Turner, J.: "...just a one shot deal?"

Curry: "It's a monthly basis, I think."

Turner, J.: "Excuse me?"

Curry: "I think I was told by the Commerce Commission, that it

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

was on a monthly basis. I... "

Turner, J.: "All right, Representative."

Curry: "You know what, I'd have to clarify that."

Turner, J.: "Well, that concerns me then so..."

- Curry: "I'd have to clarify that for you, Representative Turner.

  I can't answer one way or another."
- Turner, J.: "Well, we both come from somewhat rural districts, perhaps me more than you, but pretty rural. I'm curious, if in fact, it is correct that \$9 million a month is gonna be taken from the Road Fund, does that not give you some concern? About the..."
- Curry: "It's already being done right now. What we're saying is we want to include pedestrian crossings in the... in this Fund so that those funds can be allocated to build these crossings. It's already being done right now."

Curry: "Pedestrian crossings..."

Turner, J.: "... ring correct to me."

- Curry: "... are not allowed to be funded as a part of the Grade

  Crossing Protection Fund. Right now, only crossings that

  have vehicles going across are the ones that are upgraded."
- Turner, J.: "You're going to upgrade something or repair something now that is not being upgraded at this juncture, right? I mean, that's the purpose of the Bill?"

Curry: "Correct."

Curry: "Correct."

Turner, J.: "And the amount of money that that will take is gonna
 be, and we're guessing, 'cause I know you don't know, about
 \$9 million per month, correct?"

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Curry: "No. That's how much is going in there right now for this particular Program. We have no idea what the problem is out there with pedestrian crossings. All I'm saying is that this is not the only community, a rural community across the state, that experiences this kind of problem. With the increase in rail traffic across this state, there are many communities, like Tolono, that face this very same problem."

Turner, J.: "Are there any opponents to the Bill?"

Curry: "Not that I'm aware of."

Turner, J.: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, you've told the Body that it's \$9 million a month?"

Curry: "You know, Representative Parke, I'm going to have to check on that. I talked to the I.C.C. today. At one point in time, I was told that it was \$9 million and then \$9 million a month. So, I can't answer exactly what goes into that Fund on an annual basis."

Parke: "Would you be kind enough to pull the Bill? I don't want to vote on this until I understand what's going on."

Curry: "No, I don't think so at this point."

Parke: "Well, I'm not going to vote for your Bill then."

Curry: "I don't think the amount of money in there..."

Parke: "Has a Fiscal Note been filed on this?"

Curry: "What?"

Parke: "Has a Fiscal Note been filed on this?"

Curry: "Not that I'm aware of. Obviously, I wouldn't be calling it on a Third Reading if there were."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Parke: "Does this... Does this affect just your county or every county in the state?"

Curry: "I think any Legislator that has a small rural community, this affects. If they have a rail system going through their community, where that train is blocking crossings. I don't think that Tolono is the only community that this affects. Obviously, there are many communities across the state that would be able to benefit from the change in this law."

Parke: "How much is in the Road Fund now, Representative?"

Curry: "I don't know. Maybe your staff could help you."

Parke: "Well, we're going to take \$9 million a month, but we don't know how much that is."

Curry: "No, we are already... Sir, we are already... We are already funding this Program. All I want to do is add pedestrian crossings to be one of the items that could be funded under the Program."

Parke: "Now I understand what you're trying to do. But if you do this, you take certain more money out of the Road Fund; and therefore, it may short some other aspect and some other responsibility of the Road Fund. Now if you don't know what the money is that's involved, you ought not to ask us to vote for this. Now, I want some answers. And if you're not going to give us answers, then you should pull the Bill, get your information, and share it with us next week. There's no rush to pass this through; it's only a responsible approach. I mean, I don't know if this sets a precedent. Tomorrow, there may be somebody else saying, 'I think this is a good idea to take money out of the Road Fund.' You know, in addition, I don't know how this affects upstate. You keep saying rural. Well, we pay a tremendous amount of money into the Road Fund, upstate. We

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

pay the majority of the money going into the Road Fund from... from upstate. So, I don't know what this does, because tomorrow we may have to come back and ask for more tax revenue to go in the Road Fund."

Curry: "You know, Representative Parke, this has to do with the Illinois Commerce Commission and not IDOT and not the Road Fund. It's the Grade Crossing Protection Fund. It's a Fund that we have already established. All I want to do is add pedestrian crossings to that part of the legislation in the law. Now, if you don't think that protecting children and making sure that they have a safe way to cross a railroad track isn't important, then don't vote for the Bill."

Parke: "That is not the point."

Curry: "But I think, I happen to believe..."

Parke: "Don't go telling me... Don't tell me..."

Curry: "...that the majority of the Members, that the majority of the Members of this House..."

Parke: "...that that's the only reason I would vote 'no' on this Bill."

Curry: "...believe that this is an important Bill."

Parke: "Don't tell me that I'm not concerned about children."

Curry: "It passed out of Committee."

Parke: "I am concerned about children, but I'm also concerned about the taxpayers of this state."

Curry: "You're concerned about..."

Parke: "...and the people that pay into the Road Fund."

Curry: "...the children in your district, and you don't care about the children in my district. I happen to."

Parke: "That is a lie, that is a lie, that is a lie. Do not say that on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is not true. I am asking for just basic information so that I

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

have an intelligent vote on this Bill. The Body ought to have that information. Now, don't go telling me what I am concerned about and what I'm not concerned about. I need to know how much money is coming out of the Road Fund. That's not unreasonable."

Curry: "It's not coming out of the Road Fund."

Parke: "Yes, you said it was."

Curry: "One more time, Sir..."

Parke: "Who pays for this?"

Curry: "It comes out of the Grade Crossing Protection Fund that is funded through the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "I resent anybody implying my motivations are not in concern of children. Every Member of this General Assembly has that same concern. And I resent the implications of any Member of this Body saying that. What we need to do is that she does not understand that the money comes out of taxpayer payments. She wants to expand what can be taken out. She cannot tell the Body how much money that is. Therefore, the Bill ought not to be passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand what she's trying to achieve, and I think it's worthwhile. But I need to know what that means to the overall Road Fund. I need to know what that means to the overall Fund that she wants to expand the responsibility for. And until she can provide that information, I think it's irresponsible for her to ask the Body to vote for it. I intend to vote 'no.'"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Crotty."

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of your Bill, Representative Curry, because also in my area, and I know the area right next to me, the two of us

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Representatives have met numerous times with the very same issue. And that is trains blocking intersections where students have, in fact, climbed between the railcars or gone under the railcars. So, I want to definitely tell you thank you very much for finding an area in which we can fund this program, and I look forward to working with you on this and any other projects for the safety of children. Thanks."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Andrea Moore."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Moore: "Representative, I'm not standing up to be in opposition of your Bill, but I do want to understand. This is the Grade Crossing Protection Fund."

Curry: "Correct."

Moore: "And this comes from MFT money."

Curry: "Correct. Which is administered..."

Moore: "This is part of the Railroad Safety Program?

Curry: "It's a Grade Crossing Protection Fund that's administered through the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Moore: "But it's part of the Railroad Safety Program?"

Curry: "Right."

Moore: "Now, here's what my question is. They're not allowing this language that you have for the pedestrian crossings.

Do they spend the entire fund every year?"

Curry: "They spend actually, Representative, what I've been told, they spend more. They have... they have, by rule, established somewhat of a guideline in terms of how much they'll spend. But they have actually spent more to upgrade crossings in the recent years throughout Illinois."

Moore: "Well then, my question is, if... Do they prioritize on the basis of safety how they're going to disperse this

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

money?"

Curry: "Yes."

Moore: "And so, if you are talking about a protection... a pedestrian crossway, how do you think this is going to compete with dangerous intersections that cross highways with cars full of people?"

Curry: "Well, obviously, I would hope that they would prioritize all of the crossings and try to determine which are the most hazardous. And obviously, we have some areas, like in my community which I just outlined, where again, children are taking their bikes underneath these trains to get to school everyday. I think that that's pretty hazardous and pretty serious. You know..."

Moore: "But, admittedly, it might not, in the scheme of dangerous intersections, it might not warrant a large expenditure. These are expensive items to fix. If you are doing an underpass or some kind of an overpass for a railroad, they are extremely expensive, which is why I presume they spend all their money."

Curry: "Well, what I've been told in the community that we're looking at putting a pedestrian crossing underneath the tracks, that one of these crossings could cost up to \$200 thousand. We've already had engineers give us estimates on that."

Moore: "And how much was that, Representative?"

Curry: "Two hundred thousand dollars for a pedestrian crossing to go underneath the railroad tracks, what we're talking about. Obviously, when you get more than one or two tracks, it's going to be more expensive. And I think they're just going to have to prioritize and establish rules, like they always do when we pass things like this, as to what will be funded and what won't."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Moore: "And did the Commerce Commission give an opinion on your Bill?"

Curry: "Actually, it was the Commerce Commission at a meeting that I had this past summer that suggested this legislative change."

Moore: "They said, 'We need this change', or they said,

'Representative, you can't have your crossing without a

change.'?"

Curry: "When we were talking about how to resolve the situation in Tolono, they said that the only way that the community could receive any money was for this legislative change. They also indicated to me that this Fund has had, because of Illinois First, has additional money in it right now."

Moore: "Thank you, Representative, for answering my questions.

To the Bill. I can appreciate why it might be very difficult when there is a crossing for pedestrians. This is a lot of money for a small district, but it's a very big state. And when this fund is depleted annually, and therefore good reason, I do not think it will be helpful to add another area of responsibility to an already depleted fund. So, I would respectfully vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There were some remarks made earlier, I think, that might of left the wrong impression in the Members' minds. First of all, this does not increase the funding. There is no additional Road Fund monies going into this. This is out of the Grade Crossing Protection Fund, which all of us know is used to improve railroad crossings, safety issues, those types of things. It allows that to be used for walkways, ostensibly to be used for children. So, you can create a walkway over a railroad in case it's in close

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

proximity to a school. That's all this does. Now, I know there are a number of us, Representative Parke included, we've always been staunch protectors of the Road Fund. And we will always remain staunch protectors of the Road Fund, because those who pay those motor fuel taxes deserve to those funds go into the Road Fund. Representative, back in 1995, a Bill passed this chamber, when you were in the Majority, that illegally diverted road funds to the tune of \$15,000,000, because I filed a lawsuit and we had the law declared unconstitutional. This does not, in any way, expand... use additional monies from the Road Fund. It simply allows monies from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund to be used for children safety issues in close proximity to a railroad. I think that's very fair. I don't see anything wrong with that. And we, like you, will always protect the Road Fund. This protects the Road Fund. It's a good Bill, and I would urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tim Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Johnson, in light of some developments earlier today, I'm not sure we ought to move forward with that, unless Mr. Black were here, why we might be able to get his imprimatur on something like that. Why don't we recognize Mr. Bost, who's been seeking recognition for awhile?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "I just have some real serious questions for the simple fact, I've got many crossings right now, and I understand the Fund, I understand how the Fund works. But, I have many crossings right now in my district that are dangerous, not only to children while trying to cross over, but while

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

these children are riding with their parents to cross over in a car. And we can't get those funds to put those grade crossings in. By doing this, am I then saying, 'Okay, I'm going to send that to somebody else's district and not get those grade crossings covered in my district.'? That's my concern."

Curry: "Representative Bost, I don't know what communities those are, but I do know that there's a \$30 million surplus in that Fund. So, if you have some communities where the crossings haven't been funded for an upgrade, you know, I don't know how to answer the question as to why they haven't been upgraded. But we put... we've put additional money in this Fund, you know that, over the last year. There's a surplus in this Fund. I'm just trying to do what's right for the constituents in my district, but I also think that this Bill is going to help your district, too."

Bost: "And I understand, you know, I understand your intentions are good. But I do have a lot of crossings in my district, and you know you said this is for the rural areas that are not gated at this time. I've got one crossing I can think of that is just off the edge of a Little League ballpark. And I begged and pleaded to... Let's get something done, and we've worked and tried to get it done. But the funds aren't available, or we're sending these funds other places."

Curry: "I don't know who's telling you the funds aren't available, but they're there. So, I don't know if... I don't know how they're judging, you know, what criteria they're using to judge that crossing."

Bost: "Okay."

Curry: "I understand what you're saying, but I also happen to

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

know that Tolono is not the only community in the State of Illinois where you got railroads going north and south and east and west and cutting up the town like that and where these railroads, they're keeping their cars on the tracks for, you know, the allotted time by state law is ten minutes, and we know they're staying there longer. So, it's stopping the ability for fire protection vehicles to get across. But, you know, in this instance, and we're working on that part, in this community, but in this instance the kids can't get across the track. They can't get to the other side of town where the school's at. And I don't think Tolono is the only community that has this problem."

Bost: "And I understand what you're saying, Representative, but kids are endangered in other areas, too, when those crossings are not put in."

Curry: "I understand that."

Bost: "And my only fear is, we're going to go in and we're going to build this tunnel or this overpass for this crossing and allow those children to be protected, while other children are not protected in other areas."

Curry: "Well, this Fund is going to... with the change in this law, all communities can apply for the same thing. It doesn't just say that the Village of Tolono is the only one that can take advantage of this. Any community across the state that meets the criteria by I.C.C. standards and guidelines will be able to apply for the money. And it's there, you know, and it's not totally funded by the I.C.C. It's only a certain percentage and the local community has to come up with the rest. But, you know and I know that we have small communities all across this state... couple hundred thousand dollars out of their city budget when

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

they're trying to figure out how to fix their water and sewer system is really expensive. We know that. And all I'm trying to do is provide a mechanism whereby this purpose, this project, could be funded."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "I respect what the Representative is trying to do. I'm gonna watch it very closely. I don't know how I'm going to vote on this, because I feel like in one instance, we're saying that... that we want these crossings because we do want to have the children safe. I believe that. But I also know that there's many crossings in this state that have not been taken care of, even for gated... for automobiles yet. And because of that, children are in danger there as well. And I'm concerned about the fact that maybe this might focus off to somebody else's area besides mine. And, Representative, I understand what you're trying to do, but I'm not sure this is going to help us all."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this legislation. Twenty-eight million dollars a year goes into the Protection Fund. Comes out of motor fuel tax monies and it will come out of there... It came out of there yesterday, it came out of there today, and it'll come out of there tomorrow, and this Bill has nothing at all to do with that. There's 35 million extra dollars in this Fund right now. The Lady is trying to add another provision on walkways, which has to be approved by the Commerce Commission. Mr. Bost has a problem, then he needs to talk to the Commerce Commission about getting some... getting this Bill passed and getting this money from this... from

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

the fund into a crossing that's dangerous in his district. And the Commerce Commission will look at that and can approve that. This should not be even a controversial Bill. I talked to the Railroad Associations; they're for this Bill and they support it and said it was really in their terms, not controversial at all. So, I think we need to support the Lady and her Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. While I appreciate the Lady's attempt to solve a single problem that may be in her district or near her district, I would suggest that proposing statewide legislation for that problem is wrong approach. If you've got a problem that needs that kind of attention, let's look at Illinois First. attempt a Member initiative. Let's try to solve the problem appropriately. What you're doing, however, is taking a very large fund that is not solving all of the problems of the State of Illinois and saying we're going to add more problems to that list. I have unmarked railroad crossings in my district. They need at least a light that warns In some cases, they need a gate. But at this point, I have to tell those folks, 'You can't do that. get that done, because somebody else, some place else needs a walkway, needs a crossing.' I understand the argument that there's a certain amount of money in that Fund. understand that we're not diverting that Fund. We are, however, dissipating that Fund by adding additional responsibilities. We are putting my waiting list even lower, making it even longer and making the people that are concerned about a railroad crossing being safe wait more time because somebody else wants a walkway in their area. You want a problem that's in your district solved, let's

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

solve those with Member initiatives, money from Illinois First. Let's not make the people from the districts that need the railroad crossings improved for safety have to wait any longer. It's a good idea, a bad approach; the Bill isn't appropriate. I suggest you vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative Ryder made a very good case for voting against this Bill. I agree with him. This is a good idea, but we do not have infinite money available in the Grade Crossing Protection Fund. I would suggest to those of you in the six county area that are as in dread as I am of train whistles and horns starting to blow 24 hours a day in the six county area, two years from now, that that will be your highest priority. It will not be a pedestrian overpass; it will be putting extra gates in to get the F... the Federal Railroad Administration off our backs. I would also like to point out that the Illinois Commerce Commission is not in favor of this. The Illinois Commerce

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait."

Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Curry, I have a question. In Committee there, it was my understanding that we asked you if there should be a cap put on it, because we were afraid the Fund would be exhausted, you know, for pedestrian crossings. Do you think there should be a cap put on? Didn't you sense that? There was a sense of the Committee that we were afraid that too much money was going to be siphoned off?"

Curry: "Representative Wait, I think I'd like to make a clarification on what the law says and what this legislation does. Right now, the law says that \$2.25 million can go into this Fund for the Railway Safety

93rd Legislative Day

Wait:

February 10, 2000

Protection Fund. And the first thing that has to be funded out of this program is the upgrade of railroad crossings. That doesn't have anything to do with the pedestrian crossings. All those are priorities before we even get to pedestrian crossings. And after we've spent the money to upgrade all the necessary crossings that have to be upgraded, that are priorities, then my legislation says, 'Then pedestrian crossings can be funded out of this Program.' I apologize for not making that clear before. upgrade of these crossings, these railroad But the crossings, vehicular crossings are a number one priority. Obviously, they're a priority for me. My other concern, and again, this is not the only community that faces this problem. So we have children whose safety is at risk. to ask that pedestrian crossings be added to this Program, a Program again, that has a \$30 million surplus through Illinois First, that we should take advantage of it now if there's extra money available to do these kinds of things. But vehicular crossings are the number one priority that's in this legislation, that's already in law. So that's not necessary for us to set a specific percentage of the Fund." "But I'm sure we have a number of backlogs, like you heard the colleagues say here, and they're on that backlog. really, if you try to take care of the backlog before that we would do...the pedestrian, I don't think we would ever The way I undertook when we were get to pedestrian.

Curry: "That was raised, Sir, but I don't, you know, we never got to a point where we felt that that was necessary, since there's already language in the law that limits the amount

talking about a percentage, would be, maybe you would say

the most we'd spend is five or ten percent of the Fund on

pedestrian crossings. That was not your understanding?"

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

for the whole program. And the fact that only the remainder of what's in the Fund at the end of the year could be used for the pedestrian crossings. I think that takes care of your concerns. That if there are some crossings out there that have not been upgraded, for whatever reasons, I mean, I don't know because I don't know how many crossings are out there right now where communities are requesting funding for such things, but the I.C.C. is not going to put pedestrian crossings above these. We just want this included in the program for those extra funds that are there so we can take advantage of it."

"To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Until we answer this question

Wait: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Until we answer this question on the percentages that would be used for it, I guess I would have some serious reservation, because I'm afraid we're going to shift too much to pedestrian crossings, as opposed to the vehicle crossings. And I think I would like to have this addressed before I'm willing to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I didn't hear at the beginning, how much money do you think is in this Fund?"

Curry: "State law right now allocates 2.25 million dollars... 2.2 million dollars."

Mulligan: "A month."

Curry: "A month. A month."

Mulligan: "And..."

Curry: "A month."

Mulligan: "A month into this Fund."

Curry: "A month."

Mulligan: "I were... In my area where most of the suburbs in the

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Northwest... Northwest Cook County going on up have the Northwestern Line running, and the Northwestern crosses in our downtown areas many roads that would be considered state roads, there would be such a clamor to use this money that I'm sure it would be exhausted immediately. And if you take the North Shore and some of the other suburbs our way where the Milwaukee Road goes through that goes through downtown, you'd find that. Because I worked in municipal development for awhile, and I can't tell you how many communities that we looked at putting overpasses at a great amount of cost. I'm not sure that what you're proposing would begin to cover what people in our area would then start requesting out of this Fund. doesn't sound like a totally bad idea; I just don't know how comprehensive it is. And I can't see the money, there being enough... I mean, our areas would probably apply for this money immediately."

Curry: "If, can I..."

Mulligan: "All of it and more."

Curry: "Rep..."

Mulligan: "So, I mean, I don't know if we're going to accomplish... But, there are a lot of... Well, because we have a lot of kids going across the road, I mean..."

Curry: "Representative Mulligan, if there is a railroad crossing that crosses a state highway, then a pedestrian crossing can currently be funded. But I have crossings that don't cross a state highway, and that's what I trying to do here. So, if you have a crossing that crosses a state road, then it can be... A pedestrian crossing can be funded under that Program right now."

Mulligan: "My concern is that right now with the money that's available, our communities don't apply for it because there

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

still isn't enough because it's too expensive. So, I don't see how this is going to cover it. That's all I'm suggesting."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Curry to close."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask for an 'aye' vote. This is an important issue, just not for a community in my legislative district, but for small communities all over the State of Illinois would be... benefit to this change in the law. So I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

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 77 'ayes' and 36 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lindner, did you wish to call House Bill 3548? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3548, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill arose out of a Bill last year where there was a controversy among a number of groups, and those groups worked together for over a year. Seventeen of them, I won't read all the names, but names as diverse as Equipped for Equality and State's Attorneys and the Office of Mental Health and the Department of Human Services. And, we have been meeting for a year in Chicago and devised this Mental Health Bill. The whole thrust really is to get treatment to people in a more efficient manner without warehousing them. And, it gives a lot of ins... information to the substitute

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

decision maker to allow people to use those advance health care directives. This is a totally agreed Bill, except for the Guardian and Advocacy Commission disagrees with one Section of the Bill on continuances. Despite this, it did pass unanimously out of the Mental Health Committee, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I really just want to rise and commend the Sponsor. This is a very contentious piece of legislation. A year ago, she worked long and hard with, I think, over 20 advocates who were disagreeing on what direction this Bill should go. And she's put a piece of legislation together that makes a lot of sense to me. I would recommend your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "What... what wrong are you trying to correct with this?

What... what... If we pass this legislation and make it public law, what will we do that we're not doing now?"

Lindner: "We would make our mental health system more efficient and get treatment to people faster. There's a provision in the law that would allow the judge to have the treatment hearing after the commitment hearing the same day, so instead of two weeks later, so that a person wouldn't be sitting there without medication, without treatment, and without a plan. And also, if you recall, Representative, we passed the Mental Health Treatment Preference Declaration Act, I believe last year or the year before, and this would give the same information that the recipient gets to a substitute decision maker if that recipient had named a substitute decision maker."

93rd Legislative Day February 10, 2000

Parke: "Sounds commendable. Why aren't they doing this now?"

Lindner: "Why is..."

Parke: "Why isn't the Department of Mental Health... or Human Services doing this already?"

Lindner: "I don't know."

Parke: "Will this require..."

Lindner: "Well, I think..."

Parke: "Say... Are you going to fine DHS if they don't comply or..."

Lindner: "No. I mean, most of all, I think that a lot of people have not been using these advanced mental health care directives. And, I think this legislation would encourage that use. And as I said, it's really to get treatment to the person who needs it faster and get them out of the institution and back into the community mental health system."

Parke: "Do you know, does that require DHS to hire more case workers to expedite these programs? I mean, if... If they could do it now, they should be doing it. And if they're not doing it, did they say in Committee why they're not doing this already?"

Lindner: "Well, they didn't testify in Committee. But through the whole process of looking at this Bill, it's not exactly like it's DHS's fault. Sometimes the hearings don't take place. That's why there is a provision to have the treatment hearing after the commitment hearing on the same day. Because they can't, you know, get services to the person if there isn't a treatment plan."

Parke: "Well, who's in charge of having the hearings?"

Lindner: "Well, there are lawyers that can ask for continuances, and that's sometimes why the hearings wouldn't be held.

And somebody would bring a petition for commitment or

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

somebody would have a voluntary commitment and have to get treatment. But, in a voluntary commitment, and that could be the family that would bring a petition or a friend or a number... a doctor, a number of different people could bring that petition."

Parke: "How come the Guardian and Advocacy Committee is against this?"

Lindner: "They participated in the meetings, too. They were there at all the meetings, and they have said they think this is a good Bill, except for the one portion of the Bill, and that is the Bill that does not allow numerous continuances. Before, the law was that any party could request a continuance. And now, all parties can request, I believe, it's a seven day continuance and for good causes, set out in the Statute, there can be another seven days. But there can't just be continuances after continuances. And they are afraid that this will affect their representation and maybe some... at some time they won't have enough attorneys."

Parke: "So, you're... you're expediting procedure. You're asking for increase... increases in whether or not a continuance can be done. But there's no fines and there's no penalties. This is a... This is a 'may' rather than 'shall' for the most part?"

Lindner: "No, if you want... If you... Do you want me to read you the Continuance Section?"

Parke: "No. No, I don't want you to read it to me."

Lindner: "Okay, because I was gonna say..."

Parke: "But, I'm just trying... I'm just trying to see what teeth it has in it. I mean it... It sounds..."

Lindner: "There is a shell..."

Parke: "It sounds commendable and it sounds nice. But, is it

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

really doing anything? If it's all... I mean, it sounds to me like it's, you know, please do this. It's gonna make things better for people who have mental health problems, and we all want that."

Lindner: "Well, this is a court proceeding, Representative, and it's in the Statute. And it says, you know, 'shall be entitled to this, shall be entitled to that', and so, I would assume that the judge would enforce the Statute."

Parke: "Okay."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McCarthy does not wish to call House Bill 3944. Mr. Hoffman, do you wish to call the Bill. Representative Andrea Moore, do you wish to call Senate Bill 1046? The Lady does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Brunsvold, do you wish to call Senate Bill 563? The Gentleman does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. McKeon, do you wish to call your Bill? We're waiting. Mr. Ron Stephens."

- Stephens: "Speaker, if we keep this up, we'll all be on the Aging Committee by definition."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair is prepared to adjourn. Does anyone have anything further to come before the Body? Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to ask the Members of the downstate caucus to meet in the rear of the chamber immediately following Session. Thank you."

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Why are we continuing these Special Sessions? Why don't we just end 'em? Just adjourn 'em. You keeping continuing these Perfunctory Special Sessions that we all spent before Christmas down here for. I mean, we're in Session. Why do we need to clutter the Calendar with extra paper and Sessions? Why don't we just get rid of 'em?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson, I believe it would require the consent of the Senate."

Johnson, Tom: "Well, why don't we lead sometimes?"

Speaker Madigan: "Because we..."

Johnson, Tom: "Why do we always wait for the Senate?"

Speaker Madigan: "Because we love it here. Right, Mr. Johnson?"

Johnson, Tom: "Yes. Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "The Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #56, offered by Representative Currie. 'BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, February 10, 2000, the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, 2000, at 12 o'clock noon; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, 2000, at one o'clock p.m.'"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution has been adopted. Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, 2000, at one p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye';

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

those opposed say 'no'. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, at one o'clock in the afternoon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 576, offered by Representative Delgado; House Resolution 578, offered by Representative Woolard; House Resolution 580, offered by Representative Crotty; and House Joint Resolution #48, offered by Representative Currie... Representative Hartke, are assigned to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Scott, Chairperson from the Committee on Urban Revitalization, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on February 10, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3287 and House Bill 3485; 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 3968. Representative Howard Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3911. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3990; pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3223. Representative Erwin, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3049 and House Bill 3831. Representative Novak, Chairperson from the Committee on

93rd Legislative Day

February 10, 2000

Environment and Energy, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3558; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3457; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1046. Representative Joe Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Support Enforcement, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2979; 'do pass as amended Short. Debate' House Bill 3126. Representative Gash, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on February 10, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3111, House Bill 3880; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3059, House Bill 3113 and House Bill 3869. Corrected Committee Report. Representative Steve Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Constitutional Officers, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on February 10, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3293. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on February 9, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'to the floor for consideration' House Bill 260 to the Order of Second Reading-Standard Debate. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."