124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "The House shall come to order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Representative Coy Pugh who is the Pastor of the West Englewood United Methodist Church in Chicago. Representative Pugh."

Eternal God, Father of Puqh: "Let us pray. our ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Lord, we pray that You will acknowledge our plea, come into this place, draw near to us. We pray oftentimes with ease and sometimes with frequency, but perhaps we pray with ease and frequency because we don't expect a response. Speak to our hearts, help our unbelief, help us to know that patience is not cowardice, expedience is not always synonymous politics, and vanity doesn't beget popularity. Our lives are full of involvement, issues, and problems of our daily living. Help us to understand and appreciate each pregnant moment of possibility that our life affords and the responsibility prompted by heaven's feasibility. Forgive our idolatry, pardon our promiscuity, and keep us mindful idiosyncrasies, and our hypersensitivity. Help us O'Lord, with our moral merit badges. Do to our hearts so that we may be forever mindful of our obligations as servants of the public, an obligation which we fight valiantly to obtain, diligently to preserve, and swear faithfully to uphold. Let truth be triumphant in our justice be paramount in the world, and allow mercy lives, its constant companion that righteousness overcome our inner hostilities. Teach us to work... teach us to work for peace, struggle for justice, and labor for love of all mankind. This is our prayer. Amen."

Speaker Hartke: "We shall be led in the pledge today by Representative Bassi."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

- Bassi et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hartke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, report on the Democrat side."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the records show that we have no excused House Democrat today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Poe, on the Republican side."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. One hundreed eighteen Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present, and we're ready to do the business of the state."
- Clerk Rossi: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hartke: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'be adopted' House Amendments 3 to Senate Bill 1636. Representative Mike Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture Conservation, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'be adopted' House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1281. Representative McGuire, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

same back with the following recommendation: 'be adopted' Senate Joint Resolution 68. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which following measure was referred, action taken on April 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'be adopted' House Resolution 765. Representative Novak, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment and Energy, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'be adopted' House Resolution 564. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' House Resolution 732, and recommends 'be adopted' House Amendment 13 and 14 to Senate Bill 1647. Representative Murphy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'be approved consideration' Motion #3 to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1583. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'Motion to Concur' with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2261.

Speaker Hartke: "Rules Report."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations:

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

'to the floor for consideration' House Joint Resolution #70, offered by Representative Klingler; and to the Order of Concurrence, a 'Motion to Concur' with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3872; 'a Motion to Concur' with Senate Amendment #4 on House Bill 3876; and a 'Motion to Concur' with Senate Amendment 2 and 3 to House Bill 3939; and a 'Motion to Concur' with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4022. To the Order of Nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 168."

- Speaker Hartke: "Page 6 of the Calendar, appears House Resolution 636. Representative Reitz on House Resolution 636."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Resolution 636 sets up an Illinois water survey. This is a Bill brought forth as part of our Farm Task Force, trying to find some things to help agriculture in the State of Illinois. The Farm Bureau has drafted this legislation. With their assistance, I'd appreciate your support on this issue."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 636?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does adopt House Resolution 636. Page 7 on the Calendar, appears House Resolution 637. Representative Smith. Michael Smith on House Resolution 637. Out of the record. House Resolution Representative Michael Smith. Out of the record. 645. Page 7 on the Calendar, on House Joint Resolution 32. Representative Garrett. Out of the record. Page 7 on the Calendar, appears House Joint Resolution Representative Garrett on the Resolution."
- Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm introducing House Joint Resolution 32 that would acknowledge that high quality child care is in short supply and that more aid to support

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

and nurture such high quality child care is crucial. Illinois needs to develop a comprehensive child care policy that recognizes the need of working families and fosters professional and community partnerships to support such needs. This Resolution creates a joint child care task force involving 12 members: 3 child care providers, 3 consumers of child care services, 3 members representing employers or businesses, and 3 members of the general public. There'll also be nonvoting members, they're directors of DHS, DCFS, DCCA, DCMS and the Capital Development Board, State Board of Education, 4 Legislative Members appointed by the Senate President, the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the House, and the Minority Leader of the House, and the

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, you say there'll be 16 Members appointed,
4 by each of the Members of the cau... Leaders of the
caucuses?"

Garrett: "Yes."

Parke: "That is correct? Have you heard of anybody objecting to this initiative?"

Garrett: "So far, no, I haven't, Representative."

Parke: "Have you put a sunset in this so that at a certain period of time a final report will be made and the Body then will decide whether or not this is doing the job you intended it to?"

Garrett: "Well, we say that the task force shall conduct the investigations and report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly by January, 2001."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Parke: "You expect that on January, 2001, that this committee then will be over unless you put in additional legislation to..."

Garrett: "Yes."

Parke... continue it?"

Garrett: "Yes."

Parke: "That is your intention to sunset at that date and then..."

Garrett: "Yes."

Parke: "...if it's doing the job you intended it to, you'll come back and redo it?"

Garrett: "Yes."

Parke: "Okay. And just tell the Body one last time, in that report what would you hope that we would find out? What do you expect to achieve with your task force?"

Garrett: "Representative, what we hope to achieve is to develop public policy for the state... to define public policy for the State of Illinois on child care issues."

Parke: "Well, I've been told that there is already a Child Care

Task Force in existence. Are you aware of that?"

Garrett: "No, I'm not."

Parke: "And I've been told that it is already doing what you've asked it to do. Were you aware of that?"

Garrett: "Can you tell me a little bit about that,

Representative?"

Parke: "Just a minute. Who asked you to put this task force together?"

Garrett: "Actually, I've been working with child care providers and my constituents. And there's been a consensus or a general belief that we need to do more in defining public policy for the State of Illinois regarding child care, which also includes high risk, you know, looking at

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

high-risk children. I can go over the specifics if you'd like, but it's somewhat lengthy."

Parke: "Well, it's our understanding that the Department of Human Services said that not only is there one task force dealing with the majority of the issues you brought up, but there's at least one other task force that deals with these kinds of issues."

Garrett: "Do you know who serves..."

Parke: "I'm sorry."

Garrett: "Representative, do you know who... I think this... I'm not aware of these other task forces that have been established, but I think what makes this different is that we are bringing people from different areas of the state and also different agencies to look at a child care policy for the State of Illinois. Not looking at specific issues but to define and to make a recommendation on child care."

Parke: "How often will your task force meet? And will this be a formal task force where there'll be a per diem and mileage paid to the members of the task force?"

Garrett: "I think that once the task force is established,
Representative, they would decide what their meeting dates
would be. And we have not talked about any per diem, but
if that is what is usually required, I think that there
should be enough money to cover any type of expenses, but
so far, that hasn't come up."

Parke: "Do you have a funding source for this task force? Do you have some place where you're going to find the money? Is it going to come out of the General Assembly or the Speaker's budget? Where's the money going to come from if you're going to provide mileage and per diems?"

Garrett: "I don't think that... So far, there hasn't been a need for any funding. I think this is really the establishment

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

of a task force to help define the public policy for future child care for the State of Illinois."

Parke: "Well, this task force is going to meet, approximately 20 months. Do you know how often you're going to meet?"

Garrett: "I didn't hear the question if there was one."

Parke: "I asked how many times your task force will be meeting... will be in existence for 20 months, how many times do you expect to call this task force together?"

Garrett: "My guess, Representative, would be once a month."

Parke: "A month... Once a month, you said?"

Garrett: "I'm just saying this. That would not be determined by me, or I don't think it's determined in this Resolution.

Once the people are brought together, it would be up to them to determine when they would meet and how often they would meet."

Parke: "Well, thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Resolution."

Parke: "To the Resolution. To the Resolution. I think on the face of it, it sounds like something that the Body should be doing, that we should look at child care as a task force. But quite frankly, from what I've been told by our staff, that at least one and perhaps two different groups are doing exactly the same thing. There's no funding source, but this looks like it could cost thousands of dollars to do this, and I think it's duplicative. And I am planning on voting 'present' on this Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for the Sponsor's reference, before she was here in 1993, Governor Edgar had a 0-8 Early Childhood Task Force that Representative Ronen served on, Representative Osterman's predecessor,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Representative Clayton, and myself. I think her Resolution is too short in time. Six months was not enough time, and it was much broader. And that task force which included providers, parents; there was, I don't know how many at the table, went on for over a year, and is the primary originator of much of the ongoing legislation now, here in the Illinois General Assembly. Whether her task force is duplicative or not, you know, I think probably we have certainly, established the path with providers and voices for Illinois children, different people that were at the table that have gone on to work with many of us in this Body to do what we've been doing. So first of all, if she's going to pass this, I think six months to report back January 1 is too soon, and if she wants to go over what we've been doing on an ongoing basis she should probably go back to that report, and to the same people that we've been working with and the Conference of Women Legislators have been working with, over the past several years. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Kendall,
Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Cross: "Was this Resolution heard in committee today?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Cross: "If so, which committee? I didn't see a posting for Children and Youth Committee, and I didn't... Seems like this is where this would belong."

Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution 32 was reported directly to the floor from the Rules Committee."

Cross: "Inquiry... Further inquiry of the Chair. Is there a reason why this did not go to the Children and Youth

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Committee, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Hartke: "What was your question?"

Cross: "Why this wasn't assigned to the Children and Youth Committee?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross, on the form that the Rules Committee decided that committee was not necessary, and it was reported directly to the floor."

Cross: "Okay. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "Representative, it's obviously pretty late in the Session. What are your plans with this Bill or Resolution assuming it passes out of here with respect to the Senate?

Do you have a Senate Sponsor today? Do you have this set up where it can pass out of the Senate this afternoon?"

Garrett: "Well, to be honest with you, Representative, I didn't know that this was going to be called. I've been working on this for a long time, so I'm happy to see that it is finally coming before the House. If we can't get it obviously called in the Senate, I would ask that during Veto Session we have that opportunity. And then, if we need to extend the deadline to give the opportunity for this task force to be set up, a fair amount of time, I would also ask for that."

Cross: "Representative, just one other point that to follow up on Representative Mulligan's comments and Representative Parke's which I think were... they took care of most of the issue. Are you aware that in this year's budget there is a Great Start Program? We've appropriated \$3 million assuming we pass this budget that frankly appears, if you're looking at your Resolution, the Great Start Program covers just about everything that you're attempting to do. And no one's going to disagree that we want to take care of

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

child care issues and take care of kids. Is there any reason though why we need to duplicate and create an advisory commission or another task force in light of what's going on with the Great Start Program?"

Garrett: "Representative, when Governor Ryan campaigned, this was one of his campaign promises that he would in fact establish a task force to look at public policy for the State of Illinois on child care issues. And it is something that I've talked to several people about whether or not we have some programs in place. I hoped that this would identify a long-term approach for the State of Illinois. And that is the purpose of this task force and for the Resolution."

Cross: "Did Governor Ryan ask you to sponsor this?"

Garrett: "No, he hasn't."

Cross: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Garrett to close."

Garrett: "I ask the Members of the House that they... If we are voting on this to give it a 'yes' vote be..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House
Joint Resolution 32?' All those in favor will vote 'yes';
those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the
record. On House Joint Resolution 32, there were 110
Members voting 'yes', and 6 people voting 'no', and 1
person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received...
And this Resolution is declared adopted. On page 6, on the
Regular Calendar, appears... On Concurrence, appears House
Bill 4022. Representative Bassi on Senate Amendment #1.
Representative Bassi."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 for the Keep Illinois Beautiful Program which adds... changes the wording to the Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs as the person to appoint seven members for the committee, and changes the appointment... or the recommendations to the Director rather than the Governor. It came out of the Senate with no opposition, and I would ask for an 'aye' from the Body."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to find the Senate Amendment if you'll bear with me here. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative... Okay. Your Motion is to accept Senate

Amendment #1, correct?"

Bassi: "Yes."

Black: "And this is an Agreed Amendment saying what agency will have responsibility for KIV, correct?"

Bassi: "Correct."

Black: "All right. Is there anything in the existing law since the general title of the Bill is <a href="Keep Illinois Beautiful">Keep Illinois Beautiful</a>; is there anything in the Bill that means old overweight people like me have to move out, or what's the underlying purpose of the Bill?"

Bassi: "Absolutely not, Representative. In fact, we would say that you are part of the beautiful part of Illinois."

Black: "Boy, you smooth talker you. How are the grants distributed?"

Bassi: "The grants right now are distributed by the Director of the Department of DCCA (Department of Commerce and

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Community Affairs). And, in fact, that's one of the reasons for moving this back to DCCA, because the grants come through that administration, and what we're doing is streamlining government."

Black: "Streamlining government. I like that. I like that. But as I read the analysis, the communities are already in the program, it isn't a competitive grant situation where someone can apply, correct?"

Bassi: "Correct."

Black: "All right."

Bassi: "Oh no, they apply. They do apply. I'm sorry, they do apply and then the grants are given out by the Director of DCCA. And the funds come through DCCA."

Black: "You have to be certified by KAB to get in KIB, or be investigated by the FBI, or is this an FYI?"

Bassi: "No, it's just an FYI; an FYI to the Director of DCCA."

Black: "I see. I only have one more question, if you'll hurry up and sign the slip so Representative Boland can be a cosponsor, all right? Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. I do appreciate your indulgence. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4022?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4027 (sic-4022). And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Adams, Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a very grave matter, one that's of ultimate importance to all of us, and especially on this side of the aisle. It seems as though a few years ago Leader Daniels' mother decided to present his appearance on this earth on the same day as tax day, and ever since then the reason I understand we're still around here is so that we could come in today and celebrate not the end of the Session but Leader Daniels' birthday. Ladies and Gentlemen, on both sides, we have cake here today and we wish Leader Daniels 'happy birthday'."
- Speaker Hartke: "Happy birthday, Representative Daniels.

  Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."
- Speaker Hartke: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, seek recognition?"
- Black: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of personal privilege. Representative Tenhouse got so excited over the birthday announcement that he forgot to say there's cake down in the front. There were two cakes but we sent Representative Wait to pick them up and he ate one on the way back."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 3 on... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And thank you for the birthday wishes. It is Representative Wait's birthday today and Brad Bolin's birthday today. So, I don't know where Brad is, it's his birthday, as well. But also, I'd like to take this opportunity to, in advance, wish the Speaker a 'happy

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

birthday' on April 19th. So, if you'd join in... Why don't we just sing 'happy birthday' to everybody? Huh. What'll you think? All right. (sings happy birthday song)."

Speaker Hartke: "Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Resolution 564. Representative Woolard on House Resolution 564."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we're dealing with here is a Resolution that will accommodate the Congress knowing the desires of this legislative Body toward ensuring that coal miners across this state continue to receive the benefits that they expected when they retired. I know that there have been lawsuits in the erosion through Congress action that have caused some of them to be very fearful that their benefit package will continue to erode and be reduced to a level that they can't subside. So, I would encourage everyone to support House Resolution 564, and take care of the pensions of those people who have given themselves through the years."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, I'm not from a coal area, so I'm not sure

I understand why this is necessary. How are they losing
pension benefits? Can you tell us why this is necessary,
and what you're trying to solve?"

Woolard: "There have been several of the court cases that have come through the pike that have caused the erosion of these monies. I know that this is the health care benefits that we're talking about, and we're very concerned about the fact that these people have lost these monies over the last several years. We don't want this erosion to continue."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Parke: "How will you solve the problem with this Resolution?"

Woolard: "We're only asking Congress to continue to monitor this on behalf of those coal miners and their families."

Parke: "Are they to report to us with their findings or is this just a say 'hey pay attention to this'?"

Woolard: "No, this is only an encouragement from us to them to do their job."

Parke: "It sounds like something we probably should do, and I'd be curious to see what they find out, Representative. Representative, perhaps you might be able to let us know in a year from now, when you're in the Senate, whether or not that Resolution worked."

Woolard: "I honestly didn't hear you."

Parke: "I said, perhaps somebody will let us know what the results of your Resolution might be in a year or so, so that we can stay abreast of that."

Woolard: "I think that's a good idea. There was a similar

Resolution that came through the Senate as well that has

been sent to Congress for the same purpose."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 564?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On the Supplemental Calendar #1, on Resolutions, appears House Resolution 732. Representative Lopez on the Resolution."

Lopez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Joint Resolution 732 is basically the same Resolution that we passed the House Resolution 50. It has to do with the vending machines task force study, the method of the vending machines to stop selling cigarettes.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 732?' All those in favor will vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 732, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 732. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Resolutions, Resolution 765. on appears House Representative Feigenholtz on the Resolution."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 765 is a committee Resolution sponsored by myself and Representative Kosel dealing with the Olmstead Decision asking the Department of Human Services to coordinate efforts with other agencies around the issue of community-based independent living."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 765?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 765, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 765. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Joint Resolution 68. Representative Flowers on the Resolution."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 68 called for the recognition of seniors' week, May 1st through May 7th. And

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "Recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, what is the definition of senior? How old do you have to be? Is there a specific definition of senior?"

Flowers: "According to Federal Law, there is a definition for seniors."

Black: "Okay."

Flowers: "And I don't want to say, it might be 62."

Black: "Okay."

Flowers: "But I can't say for sure."

Black: "I appreciate it. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. To the Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Resolution."

Black: "I will be voting 'present' on this Resolution as I have a conflict of interest, a potential conflict of interest, as I think I am one."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 68?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Regular Calendar, on Resolutions, on page 7, appears House Joint Resolution 38. Representative Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 38 changes that we'd have a flag month instead of flag day. This was brought to me by the Illinois AMVETS. And a local AMVET brought this to me.

And they would like to declare between June 14th through

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- July 14th as American Flag Month for the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 38?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 38. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Joint Resolution 70. Representative Klingler."
- Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution would name the building in Springfield that houses the Office of the State's Attorneys Appellate Prosecutor, the Kenneth R. Boyle Building. Mr. Boyle had been a state's attorney of Macoupin County, and then he later formed the State's Attorneys Appellate Service Commission to serve state's attorneys offices throughout the state, and then was an Executive Director. And I would ask for passage of this Bill... of this Resolution."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 70?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Joint Resolution 70, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution is adopted. On page 6, on the Regular Calendar, appears House Resolution 535. Representative Lawfer. 535. 553, excuse me."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker). This Resolution

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

calls upon the U.S. Congress to represent and recognize that there is a difference between industrial hemp, and it points out the definition of industrial hemp. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "May we please have a Roll Call on this Resolution?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sure. Further discussion? The question is,

'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 553?' All those in
favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there were
60 Members voting 'yes', 49 Members voting 'no', 6 Members
voting 'present'. And the House Resolution is adopted. On
page 3 on the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1577.
Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1577 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. The notes that have been requested on the Bill have been filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act creating the Southwest Suburban Railroad Redevelopment Authority. Third reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1577, we discussed it the other day at great length. I think there was some confusion about people thinking that it was the railroad Bill that actually had some criminal charges in it, which it is not; this is a

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Bill that is not opposed by the railroads. And it basically creates the Southwest Suburban Railroad Redevelopment Authority. We have now added three more towns to the original list of 22, so we have 25 towns, plus representative from Metra, who will meet and discuss different problems that we have in the Chicagoland Area, and especially, the southwest suburbs, as far as railroads causing congestion on our roads. We also want to meet and discuss with the Federal Railroad Authority, in order to discuss what they call 'the Chicago problem' which is the switching of railroad cars in the Chicago area, that almost takes half the time when a train goes from the East Coast to the West Coast; 70 hours out of an approximately 150 hours are spent in the Chicago railroad yards. When these yards are backed up, many times they back on to our streets and cause traffic tie ups, and many times even our passenger railroad cars are involved in these, and which is why Metra asked to be part of it. We just simply... debated this a long time the other day, and I would appreciate a favorable Motion."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I won't belabor the point. And in all due respect to the Sponsor, this Bill has failed once. The Amendment was put on to answer some concerns that a Representative had... that areas... communities in his legislative district weren't included in the southwest suburban railroad link location. Where do we stop? None of my communities are located in the southwest suburban railroad location. We have railroad tracks that go through towns in my district. I mean, if you defeat a Bill one day when some of us can't even get a Bill called

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

at all, and then you add three or four cities to the location of the Bill, most of us are still left out of this, and then you have to go home and say, 'Well, why would you vote to do this in a particular geographic region of the state you didn't do anything for us.' I can appreciate what the Gentleman's trying to do, and I have no doubt with the population congestion in his area. I'm sure it is a problem and it is a nuisance, but it's no less a problem and no less a nuisance in my district than his. And unless we want to just keep amending the Bill until all of the communities in the state are included, I can't go home and explain an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd first like to compliment Representative McCarthy for taking the time to amend this legislation to include three more towns that do have serious, serious train traffic problems. With all due respect to the previous Representative, this is a local issue, the tracks that we're talking about are regionally located, rather, and the traffic... ensuing traffic problems are solely in that area. And I would urge everyone to give it a strong green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Who's the Congressman from this district?"

McCarthy: "The majority, the vast majority, is represented by Bill Lipinski."

Skinner: "And what position of influence does he have in Congress that might be relevant to this Bill?"

McCarthy: "Well, I know he's chairman of a committee that would

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

be relevant to this Bill. I don't know the exact name of the committee. I think you do, though."

- Skinner: "Now, can you explain to us the bottleneck that occurs in the south suburbs for transcontinental rail traffic?"
- McCarthy: "Well, the bottleneck has been referred to by the Federal Railroad Commission that 'as the Chicago problem'; and they have said that, as I said in my opening remarks, that for a train to go from the East Coast to the West Coast, it takes approximately 150 hours, and 70 of those hours are spent in the Chicago switching yards. So, I think that is a very, very significant problem."
- Skinner: "So, that's almost half the hours in a transcontinental trip are spent in switching around in rail yards in Chicago, right?"
- McCarthy: "It is very close to half."
- Skinner: "Are there other major bottlenecks in the United States for which the Federal Government has appropriated large dollars to solve?"
- McCarthy: "I really don't feel comfortable answering that. I'm not as familiar with the federal budget as I should be, but I know they have recognized that this is going to be a significant problem, and it's going to be, you know, in need of large investments of federal dollars."
- Skinner: "In committee, Senator O'Connor... O'Malley, excuse me, I get all these Irishmen mixed up. Senator O'Malley pointed out that the Congress had appropriated a billion dollars to clean up a bottleneck in southern California, between a port and the main line of some railroad down there. Members of the General Assembly, it seems to me this is truly a regional problem, it will make the Chicago metropolitan area... It has the potential of making the Chicago metropolitan area much more economically

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

competitive for rail traffic, and for that reason I intend to support the Bill, and urge you to do also."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the comments there. And I would really say, that if another area saw that this Authority was effective in solving some of our railroad problems, they would look into forming one for the cities in their area. I don't think because this doesn't include every city in every area that that would be a reason to be against it. I think that a more focused group as this group is going to be with the 25 suburbs is a better way to handle the problem on an individual basis. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. And I did want to thank Representative Acevedo for making the Motion to reconsider this after we had some of the original misinformation cleared up."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1577?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1577, there were 59 Members voting 'yes', 48 Members voting 'no', and 10 Members voting 'present'. Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "I request Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "That is your right. Mr. Clerk, place this legislation on the Calendar of Postponed Consideration. On the Supplemental Calendar #1, on Nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 168. Representative Wojcik."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I refuse to recede with Amendment #1 and ask for a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 168."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does refuse to recede from Senate Amend... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 168. And a Conference Committee will be appointed. Supplemental Calendar #1, appears... On the Order of Concurrences, appears House Bill 1583. Representative Murphy. Representative Black on Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 is some technical changes that's been lurking around here for a long time. And there's some changes that affect a lot of people in the system. And we move to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate (sic-House) Bill 1583."

Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoeft: "This is a bipartisan Bill. Representative Murphy and I have worked on the pension issues as chairmen from both sides of the aisle. Representative Murphy, was this Bill put together by the Pension Laws Commission, staff, and also the staff of each one of the caucuses?"

Murphy: "Yes, Representative. The Republican staff people and Democratic staff, both in the House and the Senate. And it took a lot of time, and I must admire you for bringing the suggestions forward since it seemed like we wasn't going to have a pension Bill. These are the things that are little or no cost at all to the state."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Hoeft: "Was there any Member of either of the caucuses or the staff that had any concerns with any of these 40 Bills?"

Murphy: "None, whatsoever. No."

Hoeft: "Then it went through the Pension Laws Commission. And anyone of the 16 Members have any problems with any of the 40 Bills?"

Murphy: "Thought it was a great idea."

Hoeft: "And then it was passed through the directors of the five pensions, and everyone of the directors said, 'This is what is necessary.' Correct?"

Murphy: "Yes."

Hoeft: "So, this is necessary to be able to protect our pension committees throughout the state from litigation. This is technical in nature and is vital for the health of the pension systems in the State of Illinois. I would urge, strongly, both sides of the aisle pass this. I also believe that Representative Beaubien wants to make a statement."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Beaubien, the Gentleman from Lake."

Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker). I'd like to read a statement of legislative intent regarding Amendment #2 to House Bill 1583 and ask the Sponsor if this is the correct legislative intent. Amendment #2 to House Bill 1583 addresses and resolves some uncertainty in the application and interpretation of the Illinois Pension Code which was created by the decision of the Fourth Appellate Court in Mattis versus the State Universities Retirement Systems. Amendment 2 to House Bill 1583 is consistent with the prerogative of the General Assembly to define pension benefits for public employees. Amendment #2 has two parts. First, it declares that SURS correctly implemented the

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

legislative intent in its administration of the ERO and of the statute providing the retirement formulas for the SURS' It makes clear that the Money Purchase participants. Formula, Rule 2, includes only the employee contributions and the deemed employer contributions set forth in Rule 2 of Section 15-136 (a). It also clarifies that exemption statute, Section 15-185, is to be used only for the protection of the participant benefits from creditors and is not construed so as to affect benefit calculations. This clarification of existing law... This is clarification of existing law and to be applied to every SURS participant and annuitant without regard to whether their status as an employee terminates before the effective date of the Act. Second, the Amendment recognizes that persons who brought administrative review proceedings before February 16, 1995, as defined in the Bill, might be deemed to have some right under the Appellate Court's decision, and therefore, provides him... only him, some relief. These persons will have the benefit of the highest of three alternative formulas provided in the new Rule 5. the intent of the second part of this Amendment to give the increased value of the ERO contributions made his behalf by specifying calculations left undecided by the Appellate Court. For these reasons, the General Assembly should pass House Bill 1583 as amended, and specifically, Amendment 2, thereto. Thank you. Is that your intent?"

Murphy: "What?"

Beaubien: "Is that your intent?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Yes. That's exactly right."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative, just a couple of quick things.

You're saying that we are not increasing the unfunded liability of the pension systems in any way with this legislation?"

Murphy: "No, we're not, Representative."

Parke: "Are we increasing the membership of any of the pension boards with this legislation?"

Murphy: "No. No."

Parke: "Is this strictly technical and cleanup in nature?"

Murphy: "Strictly technical and cleanup except for what the Representative read on Amendment #2."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Reitz: "Representative, I was just wondering... trying to read this and trying for clarification. Does this address the offset, then, for people that happen to remarry after they have retired?"

Murphy: "Yes. It lifts a penalty for widows. She will not be penalized now if she remarries."

Reitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just simply rise to support the Bill. As it has already been alluded, this is a comprehensive technical cleanup that has come out of the Pension Laws Committee and we have not done this for a time or two and it is time that we do this. I do appreciate the

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Sponsor's commitment to me that in the Veto Session they will work to advance House Bill 428 which, in my opinion, is also a cleanup of the SERS 2.2 Formula that adversely impacted about 1500 state employees. And it's with that commitment and a sense of appreciation for that commitment, that I join with the Sponsors in urging an 'aye' vote on this Bill to clean up a great many of the technical problems that need to be cleaned up, and also, to address pending legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Murphy to close."
- Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1583?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Introductions."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #69, offered by Representative Smith, is assigned to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "Clerk, Rules announcement. Mr. Clerk, announcement. Rules announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet at 1:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet at 1:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 5 of the Calendar, Regular Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrences, appears House Bill 1992.

  Representative Kenner. Mr. Kenner, 1992."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Kenner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur with
 Senate Amendment #1 and ask for a Conference Committee be
 impaneled."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion to Nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1992. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Excuse me, Mr... or, Mr. Speaker, thanks. I initially saw a Motion to Concur up there on the board. Is the Motion a Nonconcur?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Motion is to Nonconcur."

Cross: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "On page 3, on the Regular Calendar, appears

Senate Bill 1514. Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read

the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1514 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1514, a Bill for an Act amending the Election Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

We talked about the Amendment a little bit earlier in the week. The original Bill was a Shell Bill, so the action we put on earlier actually is the Bill. Let me briefly refresh your memories. First, it imposes fines for delinquent filings of D-1s; Second, it increases the fine

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

for willfully filing a false or incomplete D-1; Third, with regard to the delinquent filings of A-1s, deletes the current schedule of fines. Instead, provides the board... the State Board of Elections with more flexibility; Fourth, the Amendment extends the scope of the ballot forfeiture provisions, it just clarifies that provision; and then Fifth, it provides that the Board may deny a political contribution, a political committee, a raffle license if they're delinquent; and Sixth, it requires... or deletes the requirement that you need to be a political committee in existence for one year before you can receive a raffle license. So, those are the six provisions of the Bill. It's been worked through with our respective staffs, and at this time, I'm not aware of any opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. When we discussed the Amendment which now becomes the Bill, there's a lot of very good information in this Bill or good material in the Bill as limiting the State Board's ability to fine and I think most of us would agree excessively. But there also is some language... a slight language change from I believe it's 'shall' to 'may'. And again, perhaps we need Representative Hannig to... for the record, indicate why that change is being sought."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr... yes, thank you Mr. Black. The current law gives the State Board of Elections absolutely no flexibility. We feel that we should allow committees

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

who have perhaps violated this provision, inadvertently, or at least for some good reason to have an opportunity to plead the mitigating circumstances. And if indeed, it makes sense to give the State Board some opportunity to impose lessor sanctions. To me that, you know, that's what we do in so many other things and I would hope that the Members would agree we should do that here."

Black: "And I think that discretionary authority is... while some may have some problems with it, I don't see any way that it could be misused. If, in fact, it would be, let's say that your committee was fined \$50 for an inadvertent miss of the filing date, and someone else's committee was fined quite a bit more, what remedy might we have? I mean, would there be an administrative review process or..."

Hannig: "Yes, exactly. That's exactly what we want to do,
Representative Black, is provide a mechanism... set up a
process where there could be a hearing like so many other
things we do as opposed to just a mathematical calculation
which we don't really think is in the best interest of
anyone."

Black: "All right. Representative, thank you very much. I appreciate your clarification."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McKeon."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

McKeon: "This Amendment, as I understand it, weakens several Sections of the current law with respect to fines, and eliminates any criminal penalty for filing a false or misleading D-1, is that correct?"

Hannig: "Representative, we passed the comprehensive language, I think, about two years ago, and like so many things we do

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

we oftentimes have to revisit at least portions of that concept. Now, we've run this whole Amendment past the folks at Common Cause and they understand what it is we're trying to do and they don't see it as a watering down. They understand we're trying to give the State Board some flexibility, so that they can do what is right. And so no one from Common Cause or the Press Association has registered in opposition to it."

McKeon: "I'm surprised they haven't. One Section that's very troubling, it says, 'The Amendment provides that the Board must take the following factors into consideration when determining the amount of the fine; one, whether the violation is willful; two, the number of days the contribution was reported late; number three, past violations of the committee for delinquent filings.' Is there anything that clarifies or gives guidance to the Board what you mean in the first criteria whether the violation was willful?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we want to allow committees to come in and actually have an opportunity to make their arguments. Right now, the fines are just a mathematical calculation. Whether this was the first time it ever happened with your Political Action Committee or whether it was the 99th time. So, we think there should be a scale, but we believe that the State Board needs to have the latitude to have a hearing, due process, to hear the evidence, and then to make a decision based on a range of options that's available to them. Right now, they have no options."

McKeon: "Well, maybe some of my colleagues who are former prosecutors or attorneys can help me with this. But it seems to me when you say whether the violation was willful

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

requires the Board to determine the intent of the person signing the various forms and question that it was a deliberate intent to deceive the Board and to deceive the public. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, let me look at a... you know, it could very well be that a violation, a filing violation, occurred because by some, you know, by some tragedy, perhaps the treasurer of your account was involved in an accident, you know, a serious auto accident, or perhaps, you know, died untimely, and so, you didn't file on time. Now, I don't think that's willful, but right now it doesn't make any difference. But if this provision was law, you could at least come forward and tell the State Board look we've had no violations in the past we've had a great operation but this is what happened and it was not a willful violation and we'd ask you to take that under consideration. So, those are the kind of things we are trying to address."

McKeon: "I'm still... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

McKeon: "I'm troubled with that terminology 'willful', and I think better terminology might be something like 'negligent' or 'grossly negligent', because I think the term 'willful' is getting us into an area where the Board is going to have to make some determination as to the intent almost analogous to the criminal intent to deceive the Board through filing a misleading or false election report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to go on record. I spoke to Representative Hannig but it was

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

already too late. There is a small glitch in reporting which allows watchdog groups to report that you're filing wrong when it's not. Actually, now you have to file names of over \$149, but you have to file addresses of people over \$150, so if you don't have to put an address on unless it's \$151, and I think the State Board should make that uniform next year, because what it does is it misleads people who are going over things looking for things to kind of pick apart. That \$150... If you've got a \$150 contribution and you did not file an address that you've done something wrong, and, of course, it's going to appear because it's over \$149. And their program, also, does not reject it if you have not put an address on over \$150. So, I think it would be a good idea for the State Board next year if they come back in to clean that glitch up."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin to close. Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a cleanup of an Act that we passed, I believe, two years ago. We worked with the State Board of Elections on the language. We worked with both sides of the aisle on the language. We've shown the language to any party that was interested. We had a committee hearing on the language and there was no opposition. So, I would at this point ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1514?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who record. On this question, there were 80 persons voting

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- 'yes', 33 people voting 'no', and 3 Members voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1514, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, Rules report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'direct floor consideration' for House Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1647."
- Speaker Hartke: "Recognize the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I respectfully move to reconsider the vote to nonconcur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 1992."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion is accepted. On page 4, on the Regular Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1636. Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1636. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McAuliffe, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, are there any other Amendments beside #2?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Do you care to withdraw Amendment #2?"
- McAuliffe: "Yes. I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Hartke: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

  Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Hamos, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, (sic-Speaker) Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a... The underlying Bill amends the Parentage Act. And it was really written by the State Bar Association. And there was one Section that we worked at very hard which is now embodied in Floor Amendment #3. what this has to do with is that in those cases where under the Parentage Act the parents are not married, some of those cases the non-custodial parent, the dad, is very much involved in their children's lives, and in other cases the dad is not involved in their children's lives. provision has... requires that in those cases where there's a visitation order with a specific visitation schedule for the non-custodial parent, if a custodial parent, the mom, let's say, wants to remove the child from the state she would have to give notice, 90-day notice, to non-custodial parent. That parent could then object and they would have to then go to court to seek permission of the court before the child could be removed from the jurisdiction... from the state. But this is really only intended to cover those cases where there's a specific visitation schedule that... and we've guessed the father is very much involved in the life of his child."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt... pass Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1636?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 says, the Amendment would provide the visitation for grandparents and is permissive. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1636?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1636, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Parentage Act of 1984. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I'd like to commend Representative Julie Hamos and Representative Flowers for all their hard work that they did putting in this Bill. It took a couple of weeks for us to all agree on something, but when we all worked together I think this Bill is something that's really needed. It's going to address the Illinois parentage rights. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Clerk?"

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Could he run down the Amendments that have been adopted

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

to the Bill?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been adopted to the Bill."

Black: "All right. Fine. Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield?"

Black: "Representative, with the addition of House Amendment #4 providing for grandparent visitation... I've looked at this very briefly and I'm not an attorney, but every year it seems like every year for the past five, six, or seven years, we have tried to provide in Illinois Statute for grandparent visitation. And it seems as if from what my constituents tell me that we never seem to make any progress in actually enabling grandparents to have standing in visitation after a dissolution of marriage. How does House Amendment #4, and perhaps the Sponsor could answer or the Sponsor of the Amendment, how does House Amendment #4 clarify this long-standing issue of grandparent visitation?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I would like to have Representative..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Black, this Amendment creates a Section of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act that lays out procedures for grandparents to receive visitation rights to their grandchildren. Previously, the only provision that gave grandparents visitation rights was Section 607 which address visitation rights for parents. Although grandparents were included in that Section, there was no procedures carved out for them.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Current law, grandparents can file a petition with the court and get reasonable visitation rights with the courts if these rights are in the best interest of the child. Now, with this Amendment, the Amendment states, 'That the grandparents may get visitation rights unless it is shown by another party that it is detrimental in the best interest of the child.'"

Black: "And, Representative, I don't disagree in any way with what you're trying to do, but it seems as if every time we get into the visitation, grandparent visitation Section of Statute, either the courts throw it out or the Judges won't implement it. I do have about four sets of grandparents in my district that have just had a very difficult time getting the necessary court orders to have visitation with the children after the divorce. I've gone through this, and again, I make it very clear I'm not an attorney, so I don't understand some of the technicalities. But I'd like some reasonable assurance that this Amendment will, in fact, clarify and add to a grandparent's right to petition the court for visitation privilege, because it seems as if everything we've done in the last four or five years doesn't end up doing that."

Flowers: "Representative Black, the intent of this Amendment is to give a strong standing for the grandparents. With this Amendment, it would be assumed, automatically, if the court deems so, that the grandparent would have a right to visitation, not unless it is proven detrimental. There was no language for this particular Section prior to this Amendment. There was no specific Section for grandparents."

Black: "But, when we say the grandparent would have a specific right, I assume that that means if the court agrees,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

because there are instances where the grandparent is part of the problem, and obviously, should not have visitation rights. So, that doesn't... It does not destroy the courts ability to say, you have no standing for visitation because of a, b, or c?"

Flowers: "You're right, Representative."

Black: "All right. Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cross, Representative... or Kendall, Representative Cross. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you. We are on the Bill, but I take it the Sponsors of the Amendments are willing to answer some questions?"

Speaker Hartke: "That's true."

Cross: "Okay. Representative Flowers, can I ask you some questions in respect to Amendment #4..."

Speaker Hartke: "Represent..."

Cross: "...which I under... which is yours... Why would... If a parent objects to... If a custodial parent or one of the natural parents objects to visitation of... by a grandparent, the court can override that objection if I'm reading this correctly, is that accurate?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Cross: "Why would we... Why would you... Why would you provide...

I guess I'm curious that a grandparent has that right,
especially if both parents, natural parents, object to it.

I mean, why do we want to go down that road?"

Flowers: "Representative, I'm sorry. What is the question again, please?"

Cross: "My question is, why would you not let the natural parents have the ultimate say with respect to visitation?"

Flowers: "Representative, we're talking about two issues here.

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

One of them being the best interest of the child, that's number one; and number two, hypothetically, if the parents are divorced and the grandparents never divorced the grandchild, so whatever ills may have spread into the feud if it did not have anything to do with the grandparents, the grandparents nor the grandchildren should be made to suffer. And so, that's the reason why we're... the court makes the ultimate decision, that's number one; number two, in the best interest of the child; number three, if it is proven that it is detrimental to the child's best interests, information is to be brought into the court and the court will make that decision."

Cross: "So. Well, let me back up a second. We... and,
Representative, you may not know this, maybe the person
helping you with the Bill next to you does. We passed a
rather extensive Bill dealing with visitation and
grandparents rights, grandparents visitation rights last
Session. How does this affect that piece of legislation?"

Flowers: "I am not familiar with that legislation. All we have here is current law. So, would you like to refer me to the Section in which you're referencing, please?"

Cross: "I'd be glad to if you can hold on a minute I'll get a copy of that piece of legislation and refer you to the Section. Perhaps, if we could hold off on it a minute, I'd like to get a copy of that and I think we can go over it. It may not affect it, but if it does I have a concern about it."

Flowers: "Okay. But, Representative Ma... We're dealing with this Section of the law, this Section. So, if it's not applicable to this Section there should not be a conflict because here we're talking about Section 607 dealing with the visitation, and specifically, specifically for

124th Legislative Day grandparents."

April 15, 2000

Cross: "Representative, I can get you a copy of what we amended last year or what we passed. I don't happen to have it right in front of me right now, but the Bill we passed

definitely dealt with grandparent visitation rights. And there was a great deal of work on it and a great deal of

input. I would ask if you could at least hold off a little

bit and I'll go get you a copy, and maybe it doesn't alter

it. But, it did deal with the visitation Section of the

statute as well as the custody Section, and with the

grandparent Section. And you are... I mean, you're being

pretty emphatic in your language talking about... It says,

'Visitation rights of grandparents shall be provided in a

subsection.' I'm very concerned about that, and that

happens even if... even if... if I read your Bill

correctly, natural parents object. And I just would like

to confirm that there's no... there's no..."

Flowers: "Speaker, okay. Let's clarify something, Representative Cross, okay, because I don't want... I'm not going to confuse the issue and I don't want the Body to be confused by what we're saying here. Now, you're talking about current law. Now, I have and you should have, the current law in front of you, that's Section 607. Now, what part of 607 are you referencing? Because, if... it's not... if you have a particular question that you would like to ask on this issue, why don't you ask the question and I'll be more than happy to try to answer you, and if I can't answer you, I'll try to get an answer for you."

Cross: "And I appreciate that, Representative. I appreciate that very much. If I... What I would ask is, if you could hold on to this for just a minute, let me get a copy of our Bill from last year, and it'll just take a minute; in fact, I

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

think we're looking for it right now, and I'd like to compare what we did to your changes. And there may not be any concerns, but if I could have just a minute I think I can..."

Flowers: "Okay. But, Representative..."

Cross: "I'll come over there and talk to you if I can just get this."

Flowers: "Okay. Is there a particular issue? Just, okay..."

Cross: "As I said, Representative, I'll be glad to..."

Flowers: "As long as we're not taking the..."

Cross: "...come over there."

Flowers: "Okay, as long as we're not taking the Bill out of..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross, why don't you talk to Representative

Flowers and I'll let Mr. Righter ask questions of the

Sponsor and then I'll come back to you? Further

discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative

McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Can we take this Bill out of the record for a minute?"

Speaker Hartke: "We can. On page 2, on the Regular Calendar, appears House Bill 4407. Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. On page 2, on the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1391. Representative Lyons. Out of the record. Mr. McAuliffe, you will notify the Chair when you are ready to go? Turn Representative McAuliffe on."

McAuliffe: "Can we hold on a couple of more minutes?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sure. What reason does the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I might make an introduction of a distinguished visitor, a person that I served with in the Illinois House; not too

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

many people here did, I know Speaker Madigan did, but is now a Federal Judge in the Northern District of Illinois. Will you please welcome, Justice Harry Leinenweber, Judge Harry Leinenweber. Former Colleague of ours in the House."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the chamber. Recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin. For what what reason do you seek recognition?"

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. In a bipartisan show here, I would like all of my colleagues to welcome one of... distinguished former Member of this House, a former Member of the State Senate when I was there on staff, a former distinguished Member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation, and the former Secretary of Labor, not a former Member of our side of the aisle, but we love her anyway, Lynn Martin."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the Illinois House. Recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I might rise to a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a minute or two. Adjournment, obviously, will take place sometime today. And I want you to join with me in wishing someone who has worked with both sides of the aisle; she was a legislative liaison for the Attorney General; she's now a liaison for the Office of Governor; I think all of you know and love, Elizabeth Wrenn Gaffney; and she's hiding over here. But Elizabeth will be leaving, this will be her last Session. She is going back to school to get her GED. And as soon as she completes that, she has been accepted from what I hear based solely

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

on the recommendation of a prominent alum of Loyola University Law School, one Michael Madigan; rumor has it, as soon as she completes her GED, she will be starting her law studies at Loyola. So, when she comes back in three years for those of us lucky enough to still be here, she will probably be a million dollar a year lobbyist. Would you join me in thanking Elizabeth Wrenn Gaffney and wishing her well."

Speaker Hartke: "Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take that Bill off the board.

On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 3872 on the

Order of Concurrences on Senate Amendment #2.

Representative Daniels."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Daniels: my pleasure to present House Bill 3872, our Senior Circuit Breaker Expansion legislation. Ladies and Gentlemen, as we pass this initiative today we are creating the finest Senior Citizen Assistance Program in the nation. I'd like to thank the AARP for their assistance and the Members of this House for their assistance in presenting this Bill to you. And I'd also like to thank all of you for recognizing that our seniors deserve the best. House Bill 3872 adds any prescription for the treatment of cancer, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, glaucoma, lung disease and smoking-related illnesses as drugs covered under the Circuit Breaker. Programs now cover drugs for cardiovascular disease, diabetes and arthritis. It expands the eligibility for the Circuit Breaker Program to include all senior citizens 65 and older and disabled persons with an income of one person 21,218 or less, family of two \$28,480 or less, and a family of three or more \$35,740 or less. Now, the Circuit Breaker is set at \$16,000 or less per household. It provides the first \$2,000 of prescription medication free, currently

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

it's \$800. It decreases the annual program application fee to \$5, now it's 40 for persons below the poverty level, and \$25, now it's \$80 for those above. It eliminates the monthly deductible \$15 for persons above the poverty level, \$25 for those below, and replaces it with a \$3 per prescription fee for persons above the poverty level. Prescriptions would be totally free for persons below poverty level. It eliminates the provision that prohibits a person from qualifying for Circuit Breaker the same year in which they turn 65 years old. This would allow persons to qualify the same year in which they turn 65. Ιt provides that eligibility for pharmaceutical assistance shall be determined using the applicant's current income. Eligibility is now determined from previous year's income. It provides that the program shall pay for a name brand drug upon a doctor's recommendation in cases where a participant needs a drug listed as a narrow therapeutic index drug. The program now covers only generic drugs when they're available. It raises the income eligibility level for AABD to 100% of the federal poverty level or less than three-year phase in, or less over a three-year phase in; 70% in FY '01; 85% in FY '02, and 100% in FY '03. requires that a notice be printed on each property tax bill notifying the taxpayer that they may be eligible for the Circuit Breaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me also point out that we include an extra \$1 million in the budget to help the Department of Aging promote this wonderful program so that now we will have, actually, a department that will be designated to promote the Circuit Breaker Program which we all know when we pass this will be the finest in the United States of America. This is good legislation that is legislation that tells our greatest

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

generation that we care. So, I'm very proud of being the Sponsor of this legislation and I ask for your support of this measure."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Mr. Daniels, which agency will have the administrative duties to administer this program?"

Daniels: "It'll stay with the Department of Revenue."

Franks: "Okay. When I presented my Bill, Prescription Drug
Discount Plan, I had the Department of Revenue
administering the Bill and at that time you criticized
that. Has there been something that's changed your mind?"

Daniels: "Are you gonna support this Bill, are you just gonna take shots at it?"

Franks: "I'm just... I'm absolute.. I want..."

Daniels: "Okay. I'm not debating your Bill, we're presenting a Circuit Breaker Bill. I'd be happy to answer questions on that."

Franks: "I'm asking, have you talked to the Department of Revenue? What made you now want them to administer this program?"

Daniels: "Because the cost of this Bill is substantially less than the billion dollar estimated cost of yours."

Franks: "Okay. I want to ask you about some of the coverage here. Does this Bill cover asthma?"

Daniels: "It could be considered a smoking-related illness, yes."

Franks: "So, it would cover asthma?"

Daniels: "Could be considered as a smoking-related illness, yes."

Franks: "Does it cover diseases of the liver or gall bladder?"

Daniels: "Probably not."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Franks: "Okay."

Daniels: "Unless you can tie it into smoking."

Franks: "Now, this Bill when I was reading it, it would only be reimbursed generic drugs, is that correct, unless there was some other reason?"

Daniels: "No, I don't know where you're reading that. If you read the Bill carefully, you'll note that that also covers brand name drugs, too."

Franks: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Daniels: "There'd be certain brand name drugs."

Franks: "Okay, but by and large, would it be fair to say that predominantly it's generic drugs?"

Daniels: "By and large, what we want to do is keep it at the less expensive drugs, but we can also cover brand name drugs, too."

Franks: "So, mostly it'll just be generic drugs?"

Daniels: "I can't answer that because you'll have to refer to a specific drug and then say whether or not the brand name is the one that will be covered, then you would answer it specifically as to that drug."

Franks: "Okay. Now, I've noticed that we're increasing the limits, which I'm very happy to see. But for a couple, a senior couple that makes in excess of \$28,000 a year, what will this Bill do for them?"

Daniels: "This Bill will not apply to a senior couple that makes in excess of \$28,480 a year. Keeping in mind, of course, the reason that that figure was picked, it is in excess of the federal poverty level and we do not tax pension income in Illinois. So, if a senior is retired and gets pension income, that is not taxable in the State of Illinois."

Franks: "So the answer is above \$28,500, if you're a couple, this Bill does not apply to them."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Daniels: "We are applying those to the people that need it the most so that we can afford tax relief or senior citizen assistant pharmaceutical relief to those that need it the most. And we drew this figure because it is a reasonable figure in today's economy and today's laws and avoids an unnecessary expenditure for wealthy people such as other Bills that may have provided."

Franks: "I'm not disputing the extension, but wouldn't it be fair to state that if you make more than \$28,500 and you're a couple, that this Bill would not apply to them. Is that a simple yes or no, Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "If you're a family of two, the answer is yes."

Franks: "Thank you."

Daniels: "If you're a family of three or more, the answer is no."

Franks: "Correct. That's all I asked was a family of two. Now,

I was looking at the AARP statistics, and are you aware
that they believe that there are approximately, between 500
and 700,000 Illinois seniors that lack prescription drug
coverage?"

Daniels: "I'm aware that there are a number of citizens that are of senior age in Illinois that are not covered under the current Circuit Breaker Expansion Program. I am aware that we have worked with AARP who has developed this Amendment and supports it 100% as an Amendment that will make this the finest Senior Citizen Assistance Program in the United States of America. And the AARP has proudly joined in the sponsorship of this Bill."

Franks: "Absolutely. But there are approximately 500 to 700,000 seniors without prescription drug coverage in this state and this Bill, which is a fine Bill and one I wholeheartedly support, will add approximately 178,000 seniors. Is that correct?"

April 15, 2000

124th Legislative Day

Daniels: "We believe it will cover an additional 250,000."

Franks: "Two hundred and fifty, okay."

Daniels: "Yes."

Franks: "That's great, but we'd still leave out approximately 250,000 middle-income seniors, wouldn't we?"

Daniels: "Representative, this could leave out people that make a \$100,000 a year, too."

Franks: "But it leaves out anybody who makes more than \$28,500, as a couple?"

Daniels: "Unless you're a family of three or more."

Franks: "No, for a family of two or more. Okay. Well, to the Bill, then."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Franks: "This is a good Bill, and this is one that I sponsor. This is a Bill that I asked to cosponsor, as a matter of fact, both orally and in writing, but I don't see my name upon the board and I hope that gets rectified. I just want our people to know here that I think we could have accomplished so much more. We should have also passed the Senior Citizens' Prescription Discount Drug Plan. My Bill that passed this House would have reduced prices for all senior citizens for all drugs without any cost to the state. Now, these Bills are not mutually exclusive. seniors need them both and they need them now. To use a phrase that Mr. Daniels had used before, I think he's perpetuated a cruel hoax on our seniors. We needed to go farther. We need to also help our middle class. I ask all of my colleagues today to refrain from playing political games with our citizens' lives. I ask everyone to support this Bill and to vote for this Bill and become a cosponsor of this Bill. I also ask that we resolve to pass my Senior Citizens Prescription Discount Drug Plan when we come back

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

here in November. We need to help all of our seniors. We could have led the nation this year, Ladies and Gentlemen. Maine has just recently passed legislation similar to the Bill that we passed in this House, House Bill 3036, and there are six other states that are leaning that way, as well. Let's not play partisan politics with our seniors. Let's start by passing this Bill right now. I want it to go out 118-0. And let's in November, pass my Bill, too. Our seniors deserve it. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Coulson."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Daniels: "Yes, I will yield. I was so taken back by that pandering discussion just previously, I was shocked."

Coulson: "Is the money included... is money included in the Aging budget for outreach, intake, and public information services on this pharmaceutical assistance?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Coulson: "How much was allocated and in what line is it placed?"

Daniels: "One million dollars has been allocated to the Department of Aging to conduct Circuit Breaker Outreach Programs."

Coulson: "Is it your intent for the community-based providers that receive these funds to be required to develop and submit for approval, delivery plans?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Coulson: "And is it your intent that they will be required to report periodically the number of seniors or their care givers receiving each type of service, the number of applications they assist in filling out, and the number of seniors who actually access the benefits?"

124th Legislative Day April 15, 2000

Daniels: "Yes."

Coulson: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Coulson: "I want to thank the Sponsor for answering my questions. It's very important that we do have outreach to the senior citizens of this state and I think that's been included. But I want to say, specifically, that we are leading the nation with this Bill. We are providing much more than many states in pharmaceutical assistance. This is the best way that we can help a large number of our seniors receive assistance with pharmaceutical needs. We cannot always provide assistance to those who make a hundred thousand dollars a year and many of them are already insured, Mr. We need to make sure that we provide assistance that will not raise the prices for those other citizens of the State of Illinois who need pharmaceutical help and I will be voting 'yes' and I hope everyone will vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Sharp: "My God, My God, My God. My hat goes off to you, Representative Franks, because if a freshmen Legislator hadn't got up and done something to help our seniors, people wouldn't have woke up. All of a sudden now, everybody wants to jump on the bandwagon to help our seniors, to create new things to help them. Well, this is good and dandy, but we already have a Bill out there, 3036, and yes, this Bill will also be wonderful. But Representative Franks, it was you that got the ball going. And it's you that should get the credit for this. This is

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

something that should have happened years ago, but it took a freshman Legislator to stand up for what's right. now, here comes another Bill. Where were you years ago when it should have happened? I am asking that when we come back in Veto Session, that House Bill 3036 will amended under this Bill and be a part of this Bill so that we can all jointly together, for once, work together our senior citizens. It's time out for playing games. doesn't matter who does what. Franks was the one that brought this Bill to this House and it could have all been done on one accord. It doesn't matter who gets the credit. No, it doesn't as long as our senior citizens are taken So, why couldn't this had been amended onto Frank's Bill, instead of Frank's Bill being amended onto Time out for playing games with our seniors. They deserve the best, so now let's work together. November, let's bring both of these Bills to the House and get them passed. Once again, Representative Franks, thank you for waking up the other side."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Moore."

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor... excuse me, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation I think proves that he who perseveres prevails. There are a number of different provisions in this legislation, and frankly, Members on both sides of the aisle have worked on the portion that was included before the Circuit Breaker pharmaceutical. That issue has been around the House and the Senate for a long time and I would like to say thank you to the AIDS Legal Council of Chicago, the SSI Coalition and the AARP who are organizations that have helped all of us. Many times we went to committee trying to get a bipartisan Bill passed.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

I'm very pleased to see the Speaker's name right next to the Leader's name on this legislation. It's something that's good for the seniors and the State of Illinois. And I am proud to stand as a Sponsor and glad to see that it's going to have success. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Crotty."

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of House Bill 3872. I, also, have asked to be a cosponsor and I think I was told not at that time. So, I'm asking at this time, if I could be a cosponsor and I would also ask of the Sponsor, if all of us could cosponsor this Bill and make this a House Bill. Something that we all support for our seniors. I only wish that we could have had this Bill be more comprehensive, as a few of the other states have, that we could have included all medications for our seniors. But this is a step in the right direction and I'm sure, I am sure, that in the next General Assembly that we will expand on this and make things even more fair for the seniors in the State of Illinois. Would you mind? Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes."

Crotty: "Would you allow all of us to put our names on this Bill and those that wish not to, would be the ones to come up to you. Otherwise, we're going to be flooding your desk."

Daniels: "Right now, we're at 116 Sponsors."

Crotty: "Nothing on my computer shows that."

Daniels: "We're working on the list right now. So, if anyone does not one to be on it, they should let me know. But right now we're assuming there's 116 people that I'll sign to put on it."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Crotty: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief but there was a statement made from the other side of the aisle that we don't care about senior citizens. I think if you'll look back through the records that you'll find that I've been sponsoring the Circuit Breaker Bill to increase it to \$25,000 for the past six years, every year I've been here. So for that statement to come from the other side of the aisle, is strictly false. Folks, you're either for it or you're against it, so let's vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland."

Speaker, and I rise in strong support of House Bill 3872. And I'm really glad to see that two of the hyphenated Sponsors up there have seen the light, because a few years ago I had a Bill that was almost the exact replica of this, House Bill 314. We passed it out of the House of Representatives. Two of the people up there didn't vote for it, but we're glad to have them see the light and come to see that our senior citizens need this. My Bill, as you remember, would have raised the income limit to \$30,000 for a couple and would have greatly expanded it. And also expanded it out to ages 62, because as all of us are finding out, as we go through our districts that yes, people 65 and older definitely need help, we're all working toward that. But there's a whole lot of folks out there that are paying pharmaceutical bills of 200, 300, 400, \$500 a month that are in between those ages of 28 or 30 when they're most healthy and when they get 65 and can get some help with medicare. We also have a

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

problem with over a 1,800,000 people without health insurance and so, I'm hoping that those Sponsors up there, and I certainly hope that my name is one of those 118, I think that might be only fair to be one of the 116 anyway, since I pushed it out of the House. And I certainly hope that when we come back next January and I promote a Bill that would extend the Circuit Breaker provisions regarding pharmaceutical assistance to ages below 65, that these people will join me in cosponsoring that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee,

Representative Novak. He declines. The Chair recognizes

the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I support Leader Daniels in this Bill. It's an excellent piece of legislation. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Daniels, you indicated that you had 116 cosponsors on the Bill. We're all waiting to find out who the two that are not cosponsors that are in this Body, so that we'll all know who they are. Maybe we can convince them to join you. I would expect that..."

Daniels: "I think you could figure that out."

Lang: "Well, no I can't. Can I ask you to tell us who the two non-cosponsors are?"

Daniels: "I haven't finally decided, but would you like to be one of the two?"

Lang: "I would love to be one of your cosponsors. May I, Sir?"

Daniels: "Okay. You may be one of the cosponsors."

Lang: "Thank you. Well, I guess everyone... it's every man or woman for himself then, right? Thank you."

Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, could you define 'a narrow therapeutic index drug'?"

Daniels: "I didn't hear you. I'm sorry."

Davis, M.: "I'm looking at the fact that this Bill will require the Illinois Department of Public Health to promulgate a list of covered prescription drugs and these drugs will be those that meet the definition of 'a narrow therapeutic index drug'. What are those?"

Daniels: "The narrow therapeutic list is put together by the Federal Drug Administration."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Daniels: "And it guarantees the best drugs available when there aren't equivalent generic drugs, it stays with the brand name drugs."

Davis, M.: "Okay, but it would include medicines like the insulin, or the heart medicine, or those common medicines that senior..."

Daniels: "I have the list here and it does include some heart medicines. If you'd like to look at the list..."

Davis, M.: "I will come over and look at it."

Daniels: "I'd be happy to make a copy of it and send it to you."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Daniels: "You're welcome."

Davis, M.: "I do support this legislation. I think it is very significant when there is a growing rate of inflation in the State of Illinois and our senior citizens Social Security dollars are very limited. So, this will permit, perhaps, some seniors to get part-time work and still allow them to partake of the Circuit Breaker Law. I think it's

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

an excellent piece of legislation. And many times if you can't get exactly what you want, you do have to compromise. And this is a compromise piece of legislation, but it allows us to bring home something to our very needed senior citizens. I compliment the Sponsors who saw that this compromise took place and I, too, would like to be added as a cosponsor on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Peoria, Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Slone: "Thank you. Mr. Daniels... Leader Daniels. I'm sorry, I didn't hear this if you said, this takes effect on January 1, 2001. Is that right?"

Daniels: "Yes. The pharmaceutical portion."

Slone: "And then over the next few years the threshold level rises? Is that right?"

Daniels: "The Circuit Breaker takes effect January 1. The pharmaceutical provision as to the AABD is phased in over three years, which is in accordance with the Governor's budget that was filed and his recommendations."

Slone: "Can you tell me what the cost of the program is estimated to be when it's fully operative?"

Daniels: "The Circuit Breaker portion is approximately 35 to 38 million a year for the first year and then 70 million to 80 million thereafter. The AABD portion is 24 million the first year and then, of course, phased in to a total of yearly cost 90 million."

Slone: "Thank you very much. And I appreciate your Leadership on this Bill and like I think all the other Members, I certainly support it. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Kankakee, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Gentleman will yield."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Daniels. I just want to congratulate you, Lee, on this hard work on this Bill. I think it's probably, in my opinion, I think it's probably the most significant aspect of the tax relief that we've done this year and I also want to congratulate Mr. Franks. I think Jack worked very, very hard on his issue and I think, we should come back and visit that in the fall. Hopefully, the Senate will give it some consideration. Mrs. Crotty asked you about adding all of us on as Sponsors and it was kind of noisy in here and that's gonna be okay? You gonna add us all... no, you're not. Oh, okay. Do I have to come over and ask you, personally?"

Daniels: "You're okay."

Novak: "Am I okay? Okay. Okay. Well, to the Bill. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think this is a wonderful, wonderful plan we're doing, we're providing for our seniors. You know, the last time we increased the income threshold was just a few years ago, but that was the first time in like 13 or 14 years, as I can recall. So we know, over all those years inflation has taken its toll on senior citizens' incomes. So I know we're all gonna support this Bill and I'm not here to make a pandering speech, but I would like to say that, you know, under the 89th General Assembly in this era of bipartisanship, I wonder if there would have been a Democrat as a Chief Sponsor of this Bill. I ask everybody to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "Recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Will the Speaker yield?"

124th Legislative Day April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Garrett: "Will the Sponsor yield? Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Daniels, of course I would support this piece of legislation. As you know, I sit on the Health Care Committee and I would like to ask you openly that you include my name on the list of cosponsors. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Saline, Representative Fowler."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Fowler: "I want to go on record, myself, there personally. I'm on Mr... I am, thank you. But I would don't know if like also to say that while I'm happy to be a Sponsor of Bill, I'm also one of the cosponsors of the Prescription Drug Bill. Heard the statement made several times that one of the fallacies of the Prescription Drug Bill is that it accommodates those people with incomes of a hundred thousand dollars or more. I'm not gonna argue that point. There's no doubt in my mind that it does, might add, too, that there are people in the high-income brackets that are drawing Social Security who don't need it, some of those covered by Medicaid might not need it. But the one thing we're doing here on that argument has already been pointed out that we're still not covering about 250,000 people who badly need this coverage. good for those people who have these diseases that the medicine that we've already discussed covers, but again, I'm thinking of those who do not have the coverage for the medication that is not contained in this Bill. So while I am very strongly in support of this Bill, 3872, I still think that we need to address the Prescription Drug Bill

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

again when we come back in November. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black?"

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Bill, but I also feel compelled in stating the reasons that I support it. To reflect on some of the comments that have been made and most of those comments have been reelection statements at the taxpayers expense. And I... I've been here long enough to know that the Bill we have in front of us is a product of the process. Now, the process sometimes is difficult to understand, sometimes it's difficult to access, sometimes it's difficult to carry the day when you have an idea. But that's the way this system is set up and as I've said before, it's probably the greatest system ever handed down by a society on the face of this earth. Is it perfect? No, it is not. And sometimes you have to struggle and come back several times, but what you have here today before you and all of you are going to vote for it, I dare say, is a product of that process. And what I've had to endure here the last 15 minutes are things that we need to stop doing if we are to make some progress. Senior citizen legislation has evolved in this chamber, over the last 20 years, some sponsored by Democrats, some sponsored by coalitions, sponsored by Republicans, some some sponsored by individuals. And what I heard a little earlier, really, really on the last day of Session kind of leaves me just a bit cold. Because what I heard one or two people saying was in effect, 'My idea's better. My idea was first. My plan was bigger. My plan cost more. My plan cost less, but did more. My plan cost less, but did less.' You know, it's time we stopped trying to demagogue

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

every issue, understand that the process is an often complicated and difficult one, but the ones who prevail are the ones who work at the table, generally in a bipartisan fashion, and concoct a Bill that will get broad, bipartisan support. What doesn't happen in the process and thank goodness it does not, we do not generally advance ideas here on the basis of someone's press release, video clip or sound bite. So enough of all that. This Bill is before It is a product of the process of Democrats and us. Republicans. It addresses some serious concerns. And it remains a work in progress. As our society ages, we all know that is happening, we will continue to work on these very important societal issues and if we'll stop all of the senseless rhetoric, we might even be able to work together. It's time to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage,

Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thank you for the opportunity to enter something into the record in regard to this Bill, that I feel obligated to include. There ophthalmologist whose name is Dr. David Cox who practices in the City of Naperville and has been the ophthalmologist for my husband and for me, as well as our children, for many years. It was he who helped us with all of the information we needed in order to include glaucoma in those medications that are covered by the legislation that Representatives Daniels and Madigan have before us today. Dr. Cox's office sent us every bit of information to answer any question that we had and one thing that we learned, which I had not known before, glaucoma, which ultimately causes blindness, is preventable. If you detect the

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

symptoms early enough, there is an eye drop that can be used just once a day for an indefinite period, probably for the rest of that person's life, but that will, in fact, not only stop the progress of glaucoma, but actually reverse that so that that person never becomes blind, at least not from the malady known as glaucoma. So I would not only want to thank Dr. David Cox for his help in enabling us to include glaucoma in this list of illnesses for which medications would be provided, I would also like to thank Leader Daniels for his willingness to consider that as one of the options to be included in this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Clerk."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Dart: "If the Clerk could read into the record, the names of the cosponsors."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Dart, as of right now, there are no cosponsors on the Bill, other than the hyphenated cosponsors. The primary Sponsor is Representative Daniels followed by Speaker Madigan, followed by Representative Andrea Moore, Representative McGuire and Representative Coulson."

Dart: "A point of order then, I suppose. It was my understanding that there was going to be additional cosponsors added to this? Inquiry, when is that going to occur?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Dart, the answer you asked the Clerk cannot be answered by the Clerk, but should be..."

Dart: "An inquiry, I guess, of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "... directed to the Sponsor of the legislation."

Dart: "Okay, an inquiry of the Chair. When would the

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

cosponsors... will they not have to be added prior to us voting on the Bill?"

Speaker Hartke: "That's correct."

Dart: "Are there other speakers that are going to speak? If not,

I just ask to be re..."

Speaker Hartke: "Right now, you are the only light on."

Dart: "Well, seeing as we are about to vote on this matter, I would think this would be the time we'd have to add cosponsors to the Bill, would that not be the case?"

Speaker Hartke: "You could ask the Sponsor that question."

Dart: "I guess then I'd ask the Sponsor if he would yield, if he would inform me who the cospo..."

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Daniels: "Yes. Yes, I will yield. I give."

Dart: "Thank you. Could you inform myself and Members of the House, who are the cosponsors or if it would be easier, who are not, I guess?"

Daniels: "There are 116 at the present time. You're working on 115."

Dart: "Well, that's fine with me. That's fine with me."

Daniels: "Representative Dart, as soon as you're done talking, I will add all Members of the House as Sponsors of this legislation. So, if you would stop, we can add to them.

Okay?"

Dart: "Thank you very much. I have no problems with that, whatsoever."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "All right. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave of the House to add all Members as cosponsors to this legislation."

Speaker Hartke: "Leave is granted."

Daniels: "Thank you. Now, that we have finally gotten to this

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

point after many roll calls where partisan in nature and difficulties that we have, I want to congratulate the Speaker and all Members of the House for coming up with this very fine piece of legislation that makes this the best Senior Citizen Assistant Program in the United States of America. Be proud of your vote. We've all had an impact on this. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3872?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final passage. Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there were 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3872. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Morrow, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To make an announcement. To all the Members that are on the Public Utilities Committee: we met this morning, we did not adjourn the Committee, we recessed the Committee, we need you at the time that we are recessed by our Leadership to come to Room C-1 to reconsider Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1400. Immedia..."

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman asks leave. Leave is granted.

Mr. Clerk, Rules Committee."

Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "I'm sorry, I thought it was at 2:30 this meeting. This

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Public Utilities meeting is at 3 p.m. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "On House Bill... on the Regular Calendar, on page 6, on Concurrence, appears House Bill 3876.

Representative Daniels. Senate Amendment #4."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. that the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill sponsored by Speaker Madigan, Representative O'Connor, Representative Capparelli, Representative Winkel. And once again, I invite Members of the General Assembly join sponsor of this legislation. to as This legislation... I cannot think of a better time than to pass House Bill... the Senate Amendment #4, concur in to this legislation providing Illinois property owners with the one The details of this legislation are... Currently in Illinois we have a 5% tax credit for income tax paid on your tax return. This Bill would provide a 5% of the taxpayer's 1999 property tax bill would be rebated to them in the Fall. The rebate will be capped at \$300 which I think is very fair because it concentrates the relief on those that need it the most, middle-class homeowners. Rebate checks will be mailed by October 17, 2000 for those who file on or before July 17th. And checks will be mailed by December 17th for those who file between July 17th and October 17th. This Bill transfers \$280 million into a new fund to pay for the refund checks. would have loved to have made this program permanent as our current law is on five-percent, because as you know, original bill had a 10% tax credit. But since... if we can agree today on this measure, maybe we can work together to provide more permanent tax relief for our beleaguered property taxpayers. This legislation is helpful to those middle-class homeowners. I'm proud to join in sponsorship

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

with Speaker Madigan, and ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Concurrence Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3876."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Fritchey: "To the Bill. Like everybody else in this legislative Body it's always a goal and it's always an admirable goal to want to provide tax relief to the people of this state. I find it not only troubling but somewhat ironic that we are providing that tax relief or attempting to provide that tax relief in a means that not only is not fiscally prudent but in a way that is ultimately going to cost the taxpayers of this state much, much more money in the long run. As a result of the tobacco settlement that was reached with all of the states in this country, Illinois stands to receive almost \$350,000 every year. As of yesterday as a matter of fact the amount of money that we should have in our coffers right now is approximately \$415,000. By the end of the fiscal year that amount will go to approximately \$688,000. Over the past year we have spent countless hours; we have had hundreds of individuals testify around this state. personally perused thousands of pages of documents. And we've heard testimony regarding health issues facing people this in every sector of state. There's Representative in this district that does not have children that will start smoking today, tomorrow, the next day; one third of those children will die because of tobacco-related illnesses. There's not a Representative in this state that does not have seniors that are dying from tobacco-related There's not a Representative in this Body that illnesses.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

have families that will suffer tobacco-related illnesses. Yet, every time I try to talk to somebody about doing something on this issue they said, 'We'll get back to you on this.' I tried to talk to the Governor's Office, they said, 'Representative, we'll get back to you on this.' I met with Leadership on the other side of the aisle, they were very forthcoming. understand what it is you want to do, but I think we have a difference of opinion. The Senate on the other hand... My gosh, all year the Senate's said, 'We don't want to touch for any reason whatsoever.' this money This money shouldn't be touched until everything gets resolved with litigation. But boy, I've got to tell you. election year starts to come around, and the election starts to draw close, Republican Leadership on the Senate side, they couldn't be fast enough to throw thousands hundreds of thousands of dollars towards things that will sound real, real good in mailers. We're giving people not \$300 a piece around this state, we're giving them a maximum \$300, that's 300 taxable dollars by the way in case you didn't realize that, so that money's going to be cut into. I'm going to tell you, folks, we will be back here. I may not be back here, but this Body will be back here several years from now saying that we made a terrible mistake, that we wound up costing the taxpayers of this state money. ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure', that's been said for a reason. We'll be costing the taxpayers money when we look at the health care costs that we have incurred. That if we look at the health care costs... we look at the lives lost because we are more eager to have good mail pieces than a comprehensive health plan. We had an opportunity to be a model in this country on what to do

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

with the tobacco-settlement dollars. I'm proud that everyone of my colleagues on this side of the aisle cosponsored the Health First legislation, they had a comprehensive health program. I'm proud that 40 Members on the other side of the aisle joined in voting and sending it over to the Senate. I firmly believe that everybody in this Body believes in adequate health care for kids, for families, for seniors. I'm proud that everybody, I think, believes that we should make that commitment going forward into the future. I'm at a loss that we're going to hold our head high and run around saying that we provided tax relief. This wasn't done through good government. wasn't done by slashing the budget. This wasn't done by trimming the budget. We could have cut GRF by one-half of one percent and we could have given them this property tax cut. We didn't want to do this. This wasn't even budget cuts. This was saying to department heads, instead of giving you an eight percent cut... increase we'll only give you a seven percent increase. We didn't want to do that. We're going to go around on both sides, conservatives, liberals, progressives, Democrats, Republicans, whatever you want to call yourself saying that this was good government, and this was efficient government. We've got a budget that is going to be bloated by billions of dollars. And yet, we're going to come back and say we gave tax cuts to the people. It's really unfortunate that we're doing this this way. We owe it more to ourselves; we owe more to the dignity of this chamber; we owe more to the people of this state than to achieve property tax cuts through this means. It would be one thing if we dipped into any type of fund to create these taxes. We're not even doing that. We're giving a \$300 maximum rebate, and you're putting it

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

on the lives of little kids. You're putting it on the lives of seniors. You're putting it on the lives of everybody in this state. I don't think it's right. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of House Bill It's something that a lot of us, of course, have wanted for a long time, some property tax relief. This does it even though it's just a one-shot item, one year, but it is worthwhile to take that first step. I do agree with the previous speaker though, that I think we took it out of the wrong pot of money. We had, as I read the figures, 880 some million dollars in new revenue coming in due to the growth of the economy flowing into our state coffers that we could have very easily funded this and the other rather modest tax relief, and the circuit breaker, and the earned income tax credit. We should have taken it out of that rather than out of the Tobacco Settlement Fund, because that's money that was, as we all know, came about as a result of a lawsuit by 46 attorney generals around the United States against the tobacco industry over the health issue, and that money really should have been used for health. I realize that other states have done like we're doing, they're giving tax cuts, they're fixing roads, other things out of this money. But, I believe we could have done that out of our healthy revenue stream rather than dip into that tobacco settlement money. That money should have been reserved for health. We have a great problem in this state, as in all other states; 1,800,000 people in the State of Illinois, over 300,000 of them are children that have no health insurance, probably an equal

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

number that have inadequate health insurance. That's where our priorities should have went, that and tobacco cessation to stop the drain on our Medicaid coffers and our other health funds due to tobacco-related illnesses. So, although I support the Sponsors, and I think this is a good Bill, and I intend to vote for it, I just wished we'd have done it a little bit different; taken it out of a different pot of money. And I hope we do not do this next year when we come back, continue to dip into that tobacco money. Let's reserve that money for the key health issue that we have in this state and in this nation, and that is the ever growing number of people with no health insurance. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McKeon."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

McKeon: "Representative, for the record, how much is this total tax relief package?"

Daniels: "The total tax relief package is 350 million. The cost of this Bill before you is 280 million."

McKeon: "I'm sorry I couldn't hear you. The last part..."

Daniels: "Two hundred and eighty million."

McKeon: "The total package is...?"

Daniels: "The whole package of all tax relief, including the circuit breaker, earned income tax, and this Bill is 350 million."

McKeon: "How much of this Bill is taken out of the Tobacco Settlement Fund?"

Daniels: "Two hundred and eighty million."

McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

seeking recognition, Representative Daniels to close.

Representative Daniels to close.

- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I proudly ask for the House to concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3876. And once again, would like to congratulate Speaker Madigan for his help and assistance, as well as the other Sponsors. And also to point out that we worked very closely with our Senate colleagues to make this Bill a reality. And I want to thank all of you for joining in support of this Bill. And I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3876?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'... by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no', and 2 people voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3876. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frequently, we understand and recognize the service that is given to us by people that work for the State of Illinois, and too infrequently, are we able to thank them for their outstanding work. I just noticed one of the outstanding directors in State Government that's here with us today, and members of his family. I would like to ask that Steve Schnorf, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, stand and be thanked and recognized for his outstanding contribution to the people of Illinois, along with his

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

family."

- Speaker Hartke: "What is the status of House Bill 1647?

  Representative McAuliffe. 1647. On Supplemental Calendar

  #1. On page 4 of the Regular Calendar."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1647 has been read a second time previously. Committee Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative John Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Turner. John Turner on Amendment #6 on House Bill 1647... Senate Bill 1647."
- Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I'm looking for my file. If I can come
   back to it in a minute?"
- Speaker Hartke: "No, we're going to wait."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "We're waiting for Mr. Turner to go through his files. Clerk, would you read the Rules report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'to the floor for consideration' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4176, and recommends: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1620."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker. I'd forgotten I had this Floor Amendment. It provides that upon the payment of \$3,000 to the State of Illinois that they're going to release their rights and easement access over Route 412 and the property be restored to the original owner. It contains about a hundred feet of access. And

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

that's all it does."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 1647?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #7."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #12. Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #12."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #12. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #13."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #13. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #14, offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #14."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #14. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #15, offered by Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #15. Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, there's some Amendments I'd like to

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

table."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. McAuliffe, your Motion is to table which Amendments?"

McAuliffe: "Table Amendments #1, 4, and 5."

Speaker Hartke: "The Motion is to table Amendment 1, 4, and 5.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment numbers 1, 4, and 5 are tabled. Now, to Amendment #15."

McAuliffe: "I'd like to adopt Amendment #15."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you explain the Amendment?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. Amendment #15 will encompass some of the other Amendments that we've tabled. It also would be parts of the initiative for the Illinois Department of Transportation in this state. Also, there's also language in here that helps the New Horizon and Maryville Academy to acquire some land that's currently being unused from CMS. And also, we have the Department of Corrections. And the Department of Corrections also has an interest in here with the Village of Chester."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Representative, the Section of Floor Amendment #15 that deals with the annexation of noncontiguous property troubles me. Did we not fairly recently in this General Assembly pass Chapter 247.1.1 which allowed municipalities to annex noncontiguous property if the only barrier is land owned by a forest preserve? Didn't we recently do that?"

McAuliffe: "Representative, I'm not sure on that."

Lang: "So, you don't know?"

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- McAuliffe: "I'm not sure. I don't want to give you the wrong information."
- Lang: "Well, all right, let's try this. Sorry, Representative.

  What is the goal of this particular Amendment relative to this Section?"
- McAuliffe: "There were some problems with annexation dealing with forest preserve land where one municipality thought that they could annex into another section by going through the forest preserve land, and that's what we're trying to address in this Amendment."
- Lang: "Well, who brought this particular idea to you? Is there a specific fact situation that brought this about?"
- McAuliffe: "This was an Amendment that Representative McCarthy brought to me."
- Lang: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you. Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the Representative."
- Speaker Hartke: "Please!"
- McAuliffe: "This was an Amendment that Representative McCarthy asked me to put on for him."
- Lang: "Oh. Well, you should have said that in the first place."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."
- Erwin: "Well, thank you, Speaker. It may not be necessary now, but I was just going to add my strong support for Senate Bill 1647. There are a number of other Amendments that have been folded into Amendment #15 which were fully debated in earlier legislation on this floor. So, there's some very important provisions in this Bill. I would urge everyone to vote for it."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the Sponsor asks for the option of...

  Representative Zickus, for what reason do you seek

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

recognition?"

Zickus: "I just had a question on Amendment 15. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Zickus: "Does the language in Amendment 15, is that identical to the language that was in Amendment 5?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. Yes."

Zickus: "Now, aren't we setting a dangerous precedent if... there has already been a court ruling and this seems to be a legislative attempt to circumvent a court ruling. And this is going... My understanding was that language also made this retroactive and that's going to impact other communities, other municipalities in the state."

McAuliffe: "I believe that I understand your concerns, but I don't believe that we'll be setting a precedent."

Zickus: "Well, it does set a precedent, because we already have it into law that this is a process that can be done. And there is a court case currently... going on right now. So this is giving an unfair advantage to some people who are involved in this court case. We shouldn't be doing this right now. We're just circumventing what the court ruling has been. And this is a bad piece of legislation. Without that, the Bill would be fine. But if you have that language that was formerly in Amendment 5, then I cannot support this."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "I just would like to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1647?' All those in favor
signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of
the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1647, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain land. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I think we had enough questions on the Amendment. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1647?' This is final action. All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 106... there were 89 Members voting 'yes', 18 Members voting 'no', 10 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 6 on the Regular Calendar, on Concurrences, appears House Bill 3939. Representative Daniels. Representative Currie on Amendment #6."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I ask the House to join me in concurring with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3939. This is the earned income tax credit, a measure that was signed into law by President Ford in 1975. Its purpose is to help low-income working families stay in the work place and stay off the welfare rolls. President Reagan called the EITC the best anti-poverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure, to come out of Congress. What this measure will do for Illinois residents is to apply five percent of the Federal Earned Income Tax Credit to families who are eligible for that measure against our own income tax. We

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

begin our tax system at a very low level, indeed. We begin taxing families at 49% of the federal poverty level. This measure will put a little money... keep a little money in the pockets of low-income working families; worth a little more than \$60 a year for the families who are eligible; the measure will cover about three-quarters of a million Illinois families. This has been a long time in the making as were the changes in the Circuit Breaker we discussed earlier. This has been very much a bipartisan coalition. In fact, the bipartisan Conference of Women Legislators made this a top priority for the current Spring Session. We've been working on it for at least a dozen years. takes that long from time to time to make good things happen. I would appreciate your support for this measure. If we adopt it today, Illinois will become the 13th state in the nation to adopt its own version of the Federal Earned Income Tax Credit. Let's keep low-income working families on the job."

Speaker Hartke: "Discussion on Amendment 2 and 3? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I proudly join with Representative Currie in the sponsorship of this Concurrence Motion on Senate Amendments #2 and 3. And I want to point out that she has worked very hard on this issue over the years, and that's why when the Bill came over from the Senate with my name on it, when she asked for the sponsorship of it, I was happy to work with her in furnishing that sponsorship. I would also like to suggest to Representative Currie that this is a Bill that we are very proud was put in federal effect by President Reagan and then Congress at that time, and want to thank

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

her for her sponsorship and her assistance, and support her Motion."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the House Sponsor of the Bill for the earned income tax credit for the poor, I, too, rise in support of this legislation. It is the logical extension of our welfare policy and it's reasonable and efficient because it follows along the Federal Earned Income Tax Credit. I really want to thank Voices for Illinois Children for supplying all of us with all of the information concerning the background of this Bill, and to the Conference of Women Legislators who made this a priority. Looking at my district alone, the number of people that apply for the federal claims, it will help over 11,000 people in my district. So, I hope that everyone will support this legislation."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Moore. Andrea Moore."
- Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As was mentioned before, the Conference of Women Legislators actually stood up, had a press conference, visited with different editorial boards, and has worked hard to try and get this legislation through this year. We could not have done it without the complete cooperation of all the Members and the Leaders. This is something that will... It's one of those kinds of benefits that will work all across our state which is sometimes unusual. It will benefit about a third of the people in downstate areas, another third in the metropolitan area, and then the other third will be right in the City of Chicago. It is the next step in welfare reform, and it

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

really is going to be a much needed improvement, and I'm happy to support this issue."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Peoria, Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd also like to add my voice to those supporting this excellent legislation. This really gives people another incentive to get off welfare, to continue to work, and I think it will be enormously helpful to many of our working families. And I commend, also, the Conference of Women Legislators for their leadership in developing this measure. My thanks for the Leadership of the Sponsors. And I hope to see everyone put green votes on the board."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Boland."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Boland: "Representative, would you be willing to put on the rest of us as cosponsors? I know I've been a Sponsor of this type of legislation a few years back. I also want to commend everyone for their bipartisanship on this. And as you pointed out President Reagan... it did happen during the Reagan watch, but it also expanded during President Clinton's term. And so, it is truly a bipartisan effort. And I would request that all of us be allowed to be cosponsors, unless someone should personally talk to you that they do not want to be. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mean to offend any of the Members in this chamber, but I want to go home. And everybody wants to talk and make their campaign speeches.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Send your press releases out. Let's vote on the legislation. Let's get the hell out of Springfield. I want to go home."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "Some of these issues we've talked about, we know where we stand. Let's be quiet. Let's go home. Let's vote and get the hell out of Springfield."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Morrow, keep your remarks to the Amendments.

Representative Currie to close. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black."

Black: "I want to be a cosponsor with Representative Morrow. It was my idea first. Mine was better. I introduced it back in 1986. I want to be a cosponsor, Mr. Speaker. Please? And I want to see the list. Don't you take this off the board until I see the list."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm happy to add all Members of the House as cosponsors. May I have leave to do that?"

Speaker Hartke: "Leave is granted."

Currie: "Please vote 'yes' on the Concurrence Motion on House Bill 3939."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3939?' This is final action. All those in favor will vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

- Bill 3939. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read the committee notices."
- Clerk Rossi: "Attention Members. The following committees will meet immediately: the Appropriations-General Services Committee in Room 122-B; the Appropriation-Human Services Committee in Room 118; the Local Government Committee in Room D-1; the Personnel and Pensions Committee in Room 114; the State Government Administration Committee in Room C-1. The following committees will meet at 3:45: the Appropriations-Elementary and Secondary Education Committee in Room 114; the Appropriation-Safety Committee in Room 118; the Consumer Protection Committee in Room 122-B; and the Public Utilities Committee in Room C-1."
- Speaker Hartke: "Members will go to their appropriate committees.

  The House will stand in recess till the hour of 4:15 p.m."
- (Tape malfunction) According to House Journal Room minutes, the Clerk read the committee reports at 4:33 p.m.; Supplemental Calendar No. 2 was distributed at the hour of 4:40 p.m.; Senate Bill 355 was read a second time previously."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, in committee, did anybody testify against this Amendment?"

Fritchey: "No. Thank you for bringing that up, Representative, I do appreciate that. Nobody did testify against this Amendment. And while there was some substantial opposition to previous drafts of what was going on, my understanding, right now, is that there is no opposition."

Parke: "For this to be Amendment #2, did we table Amendment #1?"
Fritchey: "No. House Amendment 1 remained in the Rules

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Committee. And, procedurally, my understanding that is that we do not need to table that, but Floor Amendment 2 actually becomes what is the active Amendment. So, there's no need to table 1."

Parke: "Say that again. I'm not sure I understand it."

Fritchey: "House Amendment 1 is in Rules. It was never discharged from Rules Committee. So, House Amendment 2 will, in effect, become the Bill."

Parke: "Just a minute, please? What is the position of Amendment 1? What is the status of Amendment 1?"

Fritchey: "It is dead in the Rules Committee. It's not going anywhere."

Parke: "Adopted?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "It was adopted?"

Fritchey: "Oh, no, no, no. I'm sorry. I thought you asked if I was positive. No, it was not. House Amendment 2 becomes the Bill. House Amendment 1 was voted down in Rules Committee."

Parke: "House Amendment 1 was voted down in Rules Committee?"

Fritchey: "That's my understanding. Yes, Sir."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Silva."

Silva: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Silva: "I had a question in regards to this Amendment. Isn't there already language that exists in either financial institutions or in banking that allows it to do that?"

Fritchey: "There's language that exists with respect to the Office of Banks and Real Estate being able to enact appropriate rules to protect the consumers of the State of

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Illinois, but there is not language within the Department of Financial Institution's authority nor in the Consumer Installment Loan Act that would give them the ability to do the same things. So, we're trying to broaden the scope to allow them to do things on behalf of the consumers."

Silva: "Now, did any groups contact you, like the National

Training Center who has been concerned about this issue?

Did you talk to them at all?"

Fritchey: "We had attempted to contact them, and..."

Silva: "If you would speak a little bit slower, then I'll be able to hear you better."

Fritchey: "Well, if you can listen quicker maybe we'd be okay.

We had attempted to contact them and we were unable to do so. This is simply allowing an expansion of the rules promulgating ability of the department."

Silva: "Representative, I still didn't hear you. It's a little bit kind of noisy."

Speaker Hartke: "Please!"

Fritchey: "This simply broadens the rule-making authority of the Department of Financial Institution to give them the ability to enact rules that will be more favorable to consumers of this state."

Silva: "My question was, if, for example, anybody contacted any of the groups that were working on that particular issue?"

Fritchey: "The groups that we were able to contact were, AARP,
who are now a proponent of this measure, and the Southwest
Organizing Project, who are also a proponent of this
measure."

Silva: "So, you didn't... you had no contact with the National Training Institute Center?"

Fritchey: "We attempted to contact them and were unable to do so."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Silva: "Thank you."

Fritchey: "And I've been informed that they have no position on this Amendment. They have been contacted."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Delgado."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Delgado: "Representative, when we talk about a lender must notify the borrower that she or he is late with a payment, and that the consumer might be interested in consumer credit counseling, can you help me understand how we're going to do that and how we can deal with languages and all that kind of stuff?"

Fritchey: "None of that is in this anymore. That was the previous Amendment. That's where we had a number of difficulty and we did want to make sure that by trying to help the consumers that we didn't do things that was actually anticonsumer. The only thing remaining in this Bill now is what is contained in Amendment #2. And what that is, is simply that the Department of Financial Institutions who presently are only unable...they are only able to promulgate rules with respect to the execution and enforcement of the provisions of their Act. Now, they would be able to promulgate rules for the protection of the consumers of the state."

Delgado: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Delgado: "It's very... On the northwest side of Chicago, we've been holding quite a few hearings regarding predatory lending. And the Northwest Federation, a northwest organization on the northwest side, has been working hard to bring attention to this dilemma that we have. And many,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

many homeowners are facing foreclosure. So, at this stage because of the Amendment change and gutting it and becoming the Bill, I want to commend the Sponsor on this, and to continue to work towards making sure that we have immediate relief for those homeowners who are facing foreclosure. And any counseling in the future that might come about as groups pop up, that we do take into account folk's work schedules, language barriers, and educational levels, so that we can make sure we're sensitive to them all. And, of course, I would go out in supporting on Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, you know, I'm looking at your Bill and the analysis, and I'm not sure I disagree with what you're doing here, but I do have a couple of questions. Because this thing really started off as being a Bill in a push with the items that are under Amendment #1 understand it, right? And we could not reach an agreement in here to agree on the items that were listed in #1. it appears to me that what you're doing here with Amendment 2 is broadening the scope of one of our agencies, Department of Financial Institution, to now take, and perhaps pursue the same issues in Amendment #1 and who knows whatever else might be out there, only we're going to let an agency just go and move with rules. Now, in your opinion, is this the way you really want to go or ought we not to deal with these issues in here as a matter of law, as opposed to enabling one of our agencies who love to promulgate rules, continue to promulgate rules? Aren't we

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

giving up our responsibilities here?"

Fritchey: "I think we often find ourselves in the situation where we will give various departments the ability to promulgate such rules as they see fit to enable them to do the business of this state. And in this case, to enable them do their business in a manner that is proconsumer in this state. This whole issue, as you are aware, was really brought to the attention, and I want to give the credit, while Representative Delgado gave me the credit, the credit really belongs to Representative Burke who brought this, not only to the awareness of this Body, but to the people throughout this state through public hearings, and through being able to get the media's attention on this issue. to your point, and I'm not trying to avoid it, is... are we micromanaging what the department can do? No, we are not. Should that be our job? I don't believe so. Presently, if the department wanted to promulgate rules that would take them beyond simply being in compliance with the provisions of their Act and doing things more proconsumer, they were unable to do so. What Amendment2 does is say, we're going to allow them to promulgate rules in the same manner as the Office of Banks and Real Estate can. And that is, rules that they see fit to be for the consumers of this state. they will have to go through, obviously, the same procedures, and if there are any questions as to the rules that the department is going to promulgate then we will address that at the appropriate time in the appropriate manner."

Johnson, Tom: "Are there any parameters in terms of what the scope of this rule-making process will be other than that kind of generic blanket term 'the interest of the consumer'? What's 'in the consumer's interest'?"

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Fritchey: "The envisioned scope is that they would be able to take actions such as Banks and Real Estate can with respect to promulgating rules for credit counseling programs and making... you know, potentially making such programs mandatory, and things along those lines. What we are trying to do is give the department whatever tools they may need to level the playing field and to protect the consumers in this process."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay, I understand. And I won't belabor the point. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Johnson, Tom: "The only thing that concerns me about this Bill is parameters. When we give to an agency a right to write rules in a whole new area that they haven't written them before, and if in fact, the parameters as I understand it, that they can write rules as it relates to what's in the consumer's best interest. What's in the consumer's best interest is often in the eyes of the beholders and agendas that might be behind that rule-making process. And I guess if we're going to pass this and I think that we will today, this is something that I guess I want to urge the Legislature and I'll certainly watch myself, in terms of the scope by which an agency like this is given a wide range of rule-making power. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Novak: "John, I know this is sort of a compromise with respect to what was proposed earlier in the Session, but Mr. Johnson brought up a point about an agency's ability and authority to promulgate rules. You know, there's another level of

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

oversight that's outside this General Assembly. But it's made up of 12 Members of both chambers, and it's called the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. And there's 6 of us on this floor, including myself, that are Members... that's a Member of this committee. Our Cochairman is Mr. Ryder. So, we have 6 Senators, 6 Representatives, and even though our JCAR law is not as strong as some of us think it should be we do have a lot of oversight authority on what type of rules and what type of... how they're going to go about promulgating these rules, because they all have to be All these certain conditions have to be done in public. met. And we are the final arbiter. We make the decision whether these rules are acceptable or not. We have the power to prohibit these rules if we think they are not fair. So, I think you're on, you know, you're on the right path, and I would ask my colleagues to support this endeavor. Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Fritchey to close."
- Fritchey: "Thank you. I think the issue has been fairly and extensively discussed. What we are trying to do is put the Department of Financial Institutions on the same footing as the Office of Banks and Real Estate, simply and exclusively for the means of protecting the individuals of this state.

  I commend again, Representative Burke and Speaker Madigan, for furthering this issue and getting us into a point that we can proceed in."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 355?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 355, a Bill for an Act relating to consumer finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Inasmuch as Floor Amendment 2 becomes the Bill, I ask for favorable consideration."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 355?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', and the House does pass Senate Bill 355. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is thereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 385. Representative Davis. Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "I make a Motion that we move to nonconcur with House Amendments 1 and 2. And I ask that... No. Okay, we're going to recede. Mr. Chairman, I... Mr. Chairman, I move to recede from House... I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 of Senate Bill 385 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Motion is... The Lady's Motion is that she refuses to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 385. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2. There has been a request for a

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Conference Committee Report. Regular Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1860. Representative Tenhouse. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1860 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tenhouse, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 simply deals with the boards and commissions issue. And this will do some reconfiguring and changes as far as boards and commissions. It has been agreed to by all the floor legislative leaders. I'd ask for a Positive Roll Call."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Could you give us a clue as to what's in this Bill except that the Legislative Leaders approve it?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Sure. Representative Skinner, we abolish following boards: Alzheimer's Task Force; High Blood Pressure Advisory Board; Rheumatic Diseases Treatment Authorities; Solid Waste Advisory Council; Task Force on Foster Parents' Bill of Rights; Tourism Promotion Fund Advisory Committee; Mass Transit Employee Anticrime Training Program Review Committee; Automotive Engineering Advisory Panel; Alternate Fuels Advisory Board; Safety Inspection and Education Advisory Committee; Year 2000 Technology Task Force; Pollution Prevention Advisory Council; White Goods Task Force; Underground Storage Tank Advisory Committee; Multicultural Services Committee;

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Regional Youth Planning Committee; Curricula Committee; Ag Advisors; Export Promotion Coordinating of Council; Advisory Board of Cancer Control; First Aid Task Force; Advisory Committee for Dental Student Grants; Health Families Initiative Steering Committee; Long Term Care Facility Inspection Consolidation Task Force; Campground and Recreational Area Advisory Illinois-Indiana Bi-State Commission; Office of Public Council; and the Taxpayer Ombudsman. The Amendment expands the following boards: the Illinois State Labor Relations Board; the Advisory Board to the Department of Natural Resources; the Civil Service Commission; the Illinois Development Finance Authority; Education and Labor Relations Board; Banking Board; Racing Board; Control Commission; Prisoner Review Board; Motor Vehicle Review Board; and the Criminal Justice Information Authority. Other changes: Compensation Review Board, removes the prohibition against Members serving more than 10 years, and removes boards reporting from May 1 to April 1 to reflect an earlier Calendar; the Illinois Council on Developmental Disabilities, reduced from 38 to 28 the Illinois Council number of voting members on Developmental Disabilities; the Board of Environmental Health Practioner, removes the prohibition against members serving more than two consecutive terms; U. of I. Board of Trustees, provides that only Illinois residents may serve the Board of Trustees for any of the following universities: U of I.; Chicago State; Governors State; Illinois State; SIU; EIU; WIU; NRU; and Northeastern Illinois University. Also, a Commission of Community Service, transfers the powers and duties of Lieutenant Governor with respect to commission and Governor; Sex

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Offender Management Board moves the deadline for developing certain guidelines and procedures to 12-31-2001; and finally, State Fire Marshal allows the Governor to set the salary not to exceed 85% of the Governor's annual salary as that was simply admitted by the action taken last year in a Public Act 91-25."

Speaker Hartke: "Fantastic. Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative... Oh, Mr. Skinner, you're still... I didn't see your light on. Mr. Skinner, continue."

Skinner: "Why?"

Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles."

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

Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Giles: "Representative, also in expanding the boards to more members on these different boards I see, and correct me if I am wrong, why are we increasing the Liquor Board Commission members' salaries from \$19,014 to 28,000? And of course, you're increasing the chair's from 22,977 to 32,000."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Representative Giles. This was agreed to by the four Legislative Leaders and the Governor. You are correct in relation to Liquor Control Commission, the members are currently paid 18,389; the Chair's paid 22,221; that would increase those salaries to 28,000 for the members and 32,000 for the chairman."

Giles: "Representative, also help me to understand why we're increasing the Prison Review Board members, their salaries from... And we're increasing it from 3 members which is 15 members now, and so we have 3 new members just coming on and the salaries are \$67,839; we're increasing their

124th Legislative Day

salaries to \$75,726. Why are we doing this,

Representative?"

Tenhouse: "We don't... I'm sorry, Representative, but we don't show the increase in salaries. We show there are increases in the number of members, and that's to reflect the increase in caseload. But our analysis does not show increase in the salary."

Giles: "Okay. I'm sorry. I think you're correct. Those are the current salaries for those members. I guess my point, Representative, is that we are giving a couple of these members on these various boards an increase in salary. Maybe the Liquor Control Commission is just one board that we're increasing the salaries, I think we just had a initiative that was put forth in this Representatives that could have increased the salaries of the State Legislators and maybe the salaries of other state employees. It's just difficult for me to give one party an increase and the other party not the same enhancement. For those reasons, Representative, on this piece of legislation, I will have to do a 'present' vote. you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1860?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1860, a Bill for an Act concerning membership duties, rights, and obligations of authorities, boards, commissions and committees."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Tenhouse."

Clerk Rossi:...Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Tenhouse."

- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we had some discussion here. Certainly stand ready to answer any more questions that might be brought forward. We certainly would encourage Members on both sides to support this Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is... Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 1860?' All those in favor... 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1860?' All those in favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1860, there are 72 Members voting 'yes', 43 Members voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, to a point of personal privilege, if I might?"

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

- Black: "Yes, I don't want to say that we've been here a long time, but earlier you all congratulated Elizabeth Wrenn Gaffney with me on going off to law school. She's back. She has her degree. It's time to go home."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 4, on the Regular Calendar, appears

  Senate Bill 1620. Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, read

  the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1620 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

offered by Representative McGuire, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1620, we'd like to withdraw Amendment #2 and present Amendment #3."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative, Amendment #2 is withdrawn.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative McGuire."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. What we'd like to do with Amendment #3 is essentially what we did with Amendment #2 in the way of notification. In addition, the Amendment becomes the Bill. Now for your information, Senate Bill 1620, Judy Myers' Bill, has already been taken care of. So, we're not trying to supersede 1620 or any such thing as that. So, that's what the Amendment is all about. And I'd try to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Dart: "Jack, I just had a couple of quick questions. I don't have a copy of the Amendment here, and I was wondering if you could just explain it somewhat. A couple of years back we passed a law dealing with the sex offenders, and I'm just curious as to what we're doing here because I don't want to do anything that's going to jeopardize the fact that these are people that we have designated are dangerous people who have to be kept for an extended period of time after their commitment because of that in order to receive

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

treatment. I just want to make sure we're not doing anything that's going to jeopardize that. Because, there was an Amendment I'd seen at one point in time which could, in effect, prevent the locating of these period. And so, I needed to get some information as far as what the subject of this Amendment is."

McGuire: "Thank you, Representative Dart. I think... As I could hear you, the best I could hear you, it does not affect your original Bill which I think we all voted for. What we're trying to do with this Amendment is to notify areas such as Joliet, which has been included in this program without notification, so we're just trying to have a notification process as we do with the landfill or hog farm or anything else that we do in the State of Illinois. When the Violent Sex Offender Program is moved into a facility which is DOC, where it was not, heretofore, in that facility before."

Dart: "Is Department of Corrections... have they weighed in on this? Are they supporting this, or neutral, or against it?"

McGuire: "I believe so."

Dart: "Which one?"

McGuire: "I'm sorry, Tom, would you repeat that? Did you say DOC and DHS?"

Dart: "Yeah. Have they taken a position on this?"

McGuire: "The answer is yes."

Dart: "And what is that position?"

McGuire: "I'll answer on advice of my attorney. I think DHS was opposed to it which is probably natural."

Dart: "Okay."

McGuire: "Yeah, they spoke in committee."

Dart: "Okay. And the Department of Correction, are they opposed

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

to it as well?"

McGuire: "Yes. Yes."

Dart: "Okay. Just one last question, Jack. Did the Amendment...

The notification part I'm all in favor of. Is there a provision in here though that would allow for communities to prevent these facilities from operating? Is this something where they have the veto authority?"

McGuire: "No, not at all."

Dart: "Okay. Thanks, Jack."

McGuire: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, you know we talked about this in committee. Is this the same Floor Amendment that you had presented to us in committee, there's no changes to it?"

McGuire: "That's correct. The only change is it becomes the Bill, Tom."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. As you well recall, there were a lot of concerns, and I know a number of the Members of the committee voted 'yes' to get this out of committee, really on your representation that should this clear the House that you would then work with the Senate in terms of refining this thing. Because I think the real concern, Jack, was that with the notice provisions it's one thing to give notice to the municipality and to the police for security reasons, but to open this up and start posting in libraries, to start public hearings, and so on, when there's really no veto power or any... Anyway, the issue really is that the city be notified for safety purposes and that, in fact, plans can be worked out to everybody's

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- satisfaction. And it was my understanding, that should this go over to the Senate, you would be willing to really work with them to take it back to that basic intent. Was that correct, or did I misunderstand that?"
- McGuire: "No, I believe that's correct, and that still stands."
- Johnson, Tom: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative McGuire to close."
- McGuire: "I would just like to ask for your 'aye' vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1620?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. Several notes have been requested on the Bill as amended, and the notes have not yet been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "That Bill will remain on Second Reading pending the notes. Supplemental Calendar #2, appears House Bill 3114 on Concurrence. Representative McAuliffe. On Senate Amendment #1."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur to Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 would add an annual stipend to the Recorder of Deeds in the County of Cook. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Black: "Representative, a question has come up. If the state mandates this stipend, can the county board of the affected county then choose to lower their salary level by the same amount?"

McAuliffe: "Mind repeating the question, again?"

Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if he answered I couldn't hear him."

Speaker Hartke: "No, he asked you to repeat the question."

Black: "Oh. Yeah, I'm sorry. It's my understanding that some counties have the opinion that if we mandate a stipend over and above the salary level, even though the stipend is supposed to be, as I read this Bill, paid by out-of-state tax dollars, the county is then free to lower the salary of the officeholder, in this case the coroner, by a like amount. And is there anything in the Bill that specifically says they cannot do that, or is that permissible under the law?"

McAuliffe: "I believe that you're talking to the Bill or towards the Amendment?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Yes, I'm sorry, are you talking to the Bill about the coroners or..."

Black: "Right."

McAuliffe: "...to the Amendment?"

Black: "On the coroner's stipend, it's in the underlying Bill, is there anything in the language that says, a county cannot then reduce the coroner's salary out of county funds by the amount of the state stipend?"

McAuliffe: "I'm not sure on that."

Black: "All right. At some point, and I know we're in a time crunch, I was always led to believe that they couldn't do that, and I think some counties feel they not only can, but

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

they will, and if that's the case, then the stipend has absolutely no impact on the coroner's salary. All it does is add an expense to the State General Revenue Fund, the coroner instead of receiving the county salary plus the state stipend, may receive the state stipend, but minus that amount from the County General Revenue Fund, gain in salary. And I'm not sure we've ever had a clarification on that, but I did have a coroner call and say, you know, what is the policy? And then in all honesty to the Sponsor, I don't know. And I don't know if there's somebody on the floor that can answer that or whatever, but I thought I would bring it up. And if there's somebody who does know whether that's permissible or not, I know there are some folks, not only in county boards, but obviously some coroners, that would like an answer to that question. There are obviously counties out there who every time a stipend is granted by the state, either have or make an attempt to reduce then, the county contribution to that salary, so the officeholder's salary stays the same, but the obligation out-of-state funds goes up. So, that's... And again, I don't raise it for any purpose except I really don't know what the answer is."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3114?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 81 Members voting 'yes', 32 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- Bill 3114. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #72, offered by Representative McKeon, is assigned to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, appears... On Concurrence, appears House Bill 3225. Representative Saviano. On Senate Amendment #1."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill... Senate Amendment... I make the Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3225. We passed the underlying Bill out. The Senate added the Amendment which includes a pay raise for our Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Board members. The compensation of the President of the Board will go from 50,000 to 60,000; the Vice President, Chairman of the Committee on Finance, will go from 45,000 to 55,000, and the commissioners will go from 40,000 to 50,000. These Commissioners have not had a pay raise since 1989, nor do they receive a COLA. told us that they will pass a ordinance or resolution on their board, authorizing those pay increases. None of this money comes from the state. I can attest that these commissioners who serve on this board, are very important suburban Legislators in that they guide us construction of the deep tunnel project through our areas, and assist us with all our flooding problems. main reason I stand before you today asking for well deserved pay increase for these commissioners. I ask for your favorable vote, and I thereby, ask to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3225. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Is there any

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3225?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 78 Members voting 'yes', 35 Members voting 'no', and 3 Members voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3225. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as a 'no' on House Bill 3225, and I inadvertently hit a 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes. Page 5 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2261. Representative Cross... On the Order of Concurrences."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on this Senate

Amendment #2. I believe Representative Mautino intends to

explain the Motion, if there are any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Senate Amendment #2, I also move to concur in this. This would increase the members of the Upper Illinois River Development Authority by two counties: Kane and McHenry. Also increases the bonding authority from 100 million to 250 million. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2261?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2261. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 3, on the Regular Calendar, appears Senate Bill 334. Representative Hultgren. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 334 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would make a Motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and table...

Amendment #3... Amendment #1 is tabled. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Motions. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 334, a Bill for an Act regarding electricity excise taxes. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Bill that, inadvertently, when we did the public utilities dereg, there was a Section that some benefits

### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

given to high-impact businesses, these are businesses that employ over a thousand people in Illinois, have a significant impact on the economic climate here in Illinois. And, inadvertently, this high-impact business provision was taken out. What we are doing with this, Senate Bill 334, is reinstating this high-impact business provision."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I know Representative Hultgren's worked very closely with the State Chamber of Commerce, and this was an oversight that took place during the last legislative action. And I do strongly stand in support of it."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 334?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 334. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 6 of the Calendar, on Concurrences, appears House Bill 4176. Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "It's my day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask and make a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 in House Bill 4176. What these Amendments do specifically... Senate Amendment #2 does. This is a Bill that did pass through the House unanimously. The Senate debated it pretty extensively, and if you'll remember this is about

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

prescription drug information cards. What this Amendment has done is that it removes the provisions that discuss the... Let me get my information here real quickly. It removes all reference to the National Council for Prescription Drug Programs; and what it does is it lists specifically, what eight fields need to be listed on this prescription drug card. All the opposition has been removed from this. The people who had been opposed to it are now neutral on it. And so, I'd ask for concurrence on the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "One and two."

Hultgren: "One and two."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 4176?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 4176. And this Bill, received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1829. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1829 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ryder, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryder."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is cited as the FY 2001 Budget Implementation Act relating to the use of bond proceeds. It amends the General Obligation Bond Act and provides for a transfer from Transportation Bond Fund to Airport Loan Revolving Fund to support the Airport Fund Loan Program. And it amends the Upper Illinois River Valley Authority Act in compliance with an Act that we just... or an action that we just took. These changes are necessary to preserve the state revenue base for FY 2001. And I would ask that we adopt Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Sponsor. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Ryder, could you indicate whether there is any adjustment made relative to the bonds for the Illinois Toll Highway Authority in this Bill?"

Ryder: "No."

Schoenberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1829?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1829, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill.

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

The explanation that I gave for the Amendment is sufficient for the Bill. I would be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1829?' This is final passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, are were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1829. This issue (sic-Bill), receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, for an... On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1828. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1828 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ryder, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill upon its adoption. And it is a number of changes to implement the budget in a nonbonding situation including such things as the extension of the KidCare Program, sunset, until July 1 of 2002. It changes several other sunset dates as well as making other substantive changes in the law so that the budget, as soon to be presented to us, can be adopted. I would be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair would like to recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is this the bond Bill?"

Ryder: "No."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Davis, M.: "No, it is not."

Ryder: "No, this is a budget implementation Bill containing substantive changes." Davis, M.: "Thank you very much."

Ryder: "Sure."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1828?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill as amended is the same as explained concerning the Amendment. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1828?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and O voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1828. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk for announcement."

Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution #71, offered by Representative Scott, is assigned to the Rules Committee. And attention Members,

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "Supplemental Calendar #2, appears on Concurrence, House Bill 3756. Representative McCarthy.

  That'd be you. On Senate Amendment #1. Representative McCarthy on Senate Amendment #1."
- McCarthy: "Would you take it out of the record just temporary, a few seconds?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Take that Bill out of the record. For what reason does the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, seeking recognition? He's declined. Mr. Clerk. Supplemental Calendar #2, on Concurrences, appears House Bill 3756. Representative McCarthy on Senate Amendment #1. Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 amends the Chicago Teacher Article of the Pension Code. It increases from 25 million to 40 million the maximum yearly amount that the Chicago Teachers Pension Fund may disburse for the purpose of reimbursing annuitants for their health insurance cost. the State Mandates Act Would amend to require implementation without reimbursement, so this will not include any state money. And the current annuitants, the system is able to fund their health insurance at about 85 to 90%. Without this increase in the funding ability, it would have to drop to about 65% of the cost which would be a great hardship for the teachers and the Chicago Teachers Union Retirement Fund who are on the Pension Fund. would ask for your favorable concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3756."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Amendment #1

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

to House Bill 3756? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative... Representative, is the Chicago Teachers
Union in favor of this?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "Is the Chicago School Board in favor of this?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "Is there anybody that you've heard that opposes this?"

McCarthy: "There are no registered opponents. And I haven't heard anybody either."

Parke: "Now, is there... Will this be a one-time or permanent raise?"

McCarthy: "It increases the maximum to 40 million on an annual basis, and that would be a permanent increase to the 40 million."

Parke: "Okay. Now, we're willing to put this Bill out for the Chicago Teachers Union and for the annuitants to help them with their health insurance costs. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "But we can't put a Bill out for the Chicago... I mean, downstate police department that will help them with... increase their benefits, is that right?"

McCarthy: "I think the difference is that this is an Agreed Bill between the employer and the employees, while that Bill is still being negotiated. But you're correct in your assumption."

Parke: "Thank you. I have no further questions. This sounds like an agreed-to Amendment, and it solves a problem that, obviously, the Chicago teachers have, and this is certainly a way of solving it."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoeft: "We have five pension systems in the State of Illinois, one of which is parallel to a non-Chicago teacher's And unfortunately, we've set this up so that the pension. Chicago teachers and the downstate teachers pension systems are dissimilar. Now the Chicago system is paid predominated by local property tax, and is right now flush with money; and so, they are saying that they would like to pay to their annuitants this capacity for their health premiums and things like this. This is excellent. This is something I think that I'm pleased with. I'm glad that they can do that. The problem with this Bill is, that the Teacher Retirement System for the rest of the state does not have the stability, and they do not have the capacity to do this. So, the only negative rub on this is that this is going to be a contrast between Chicago and the downstate teachers. And later on, undoubtedly, the TRS System, the annuitants, are going to come back and say, 'We would like a parallel Bill.' I think I would be in the position of saying, 'Hey let's do it if we had the money for it.' the only negative thing here is, if we're looking for consistency among pension systems, this is going to create So, your choice is, whether in fact you greater gap. think that we ought to be giving this to the annuitants of the Chicago system, or, in fact, whether we should have greater consistency. I'm pleased that you can do this for the Chicago teachers and have sort of a slow-down on this, but it's a good Bill for the teachers, and I compliment you for that."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really want to thank Representative Hoeft for his kind remarks. And I do think that in the future he will come here to get us... fund the Downstate Teachers Retirement Fund to a little bit higher level than it currently is paying. But this will be something that's very good for the retirees of the Chicago Teachers Union. And I'd ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3756?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 Members voting 'yes', 16 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority. And the House does adopt Senate Amendment #1... Where am I at?... And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules report?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' House Joint Resolution #71, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4374; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 4435; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 4437; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 4438; a Motion to Concur

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 4439; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4582; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4584; and a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4587. Introduction of Resolution. Senate Joint Resolution 71, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, is assigned to the Rules Committee."

- Speaker Hartke: "On page 5, on the Order of Concurrences, appears

  House Bill 2917. Senate Amendment #1. Representative

  Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with Senate
  Amendment #1. It just changes the effective date from
  January 1 to April 1. I know of no opposition. This
  passed out of here 117 to 0. And I move for its
  concurrence."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2917?' is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Holbrook, would you be so kind as to take this Bill out of the record? This Bill is out of the record. What reason does the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford, seek recognition?"
- Rutherford: "Well, I realize the hour grows late and many are tired, including, I'm sure, the Speaker himself right now, but we were right in the midst of a Roll Call. I have no idea, you know, the dynamic that was going on there, but we were in the midst of a Roll Call, the green and reds were on the board, and all of a sudden it's out of the record. Could you maybe explain a little what's going on?"

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

- Speaker Hartke: "Sure. Procedurally, there was some things that we had not done to bring it to that situation. We needed to pop it out of Rules."
- Rutherford: "Speaker, if I could, that is a very courteous thing to share with the Body as opposed to just pulling it out and leaving us all in the dark. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 2, on the Calendar, on Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1707.

  Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Leitch: "Mr. Speaker, would you please return the Bill to Second Reading for the purposes of tabling Amendment #1?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of tabling an Amendment. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Leitch moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Mr. Speaker, is Amendment #3 on the Bill?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted to the Bill."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of Senate Bill 1707 is to make possible the ability to secure the sales tax

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

benefits for purchasing of materials that are presently available to participants in enterprise zones from the community, or the township, or the county in which the enterprise zone itself is located. This has resulted in a number of sham operations, a number of companies coming in and setting up buildings, material, stores and so forth. So, what this Bill does is eliminate that. It simply says that those individuals can get the tax credits if they purchase materials from any other place in Illinois, including their own communities. So, I think it's something we should have done a long time ago. I'm happy that this Bill is being called. And I believe it's in a public interest to do this. Amendment #3 is a technical issue that addresses a problem in the metro east area. works through the Department of Revenue so that they can report for sales tax receipts, which is a technical point that needs to be clarified. With that I would ask for the adoption of Senate Bill 1707."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, would you please return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of reconsidering Amendment #1?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, place this Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Leitch, the Motion is to take from the table, Amendment #1?"

Leitch: "Yes, Sir. I'd so move."

Speaker Hartke: "That requires a... All in favor signify by saying 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is taken from the table. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. For what reason does Mr. Lang

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

seek recognition?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1707, simply taking the Amendment off the table does not readopt it. I would suggest that we take 1707 back to Second Reading, readopt Amendment #1, and then move it back to Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Leitch, would you like to take this Bill out of the record until we straighten out this parliamentarian mess?"

Leitch: "That'd be fine."

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #3 has been distributed. The Rules Committee will meet at 6:10 in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet at 6:10 in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hartke: "Supplemental Calendar #3, on Concurrences, appears House Bill 4374. For what reason do you seek recognition Representative Black?"

Black: "Yes, just an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Inquiry."

Black: "On House Calendar, Supplemental #3, I see all of these Bills have had their final passage deadline extended to April 16th. Is that a subtle message or a typo? This is April 15th. So, if it isn't a typo, you're beginning to get my attention. And if you're beginning to get my attention, I intend to get everybody else's attention. April 16th is tomorrow. Can you enlighten me, Mr. Speaker. I've great confidence in you."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes. Yes. Yes, I can. That is less than six hours. If you don't sit down, we may be here then."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Ryder on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

4374."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur with Senate Bill... Amendment #1 to House Bill 4374. And in that regard, I would tell you that Senate Amendment #1 is the final Budget Implementation Act for FY 2001. It creates transfers, implementation of the tobacco settlement monies for a rainy-day fund, long-term care provider fund, fund for Illinois future, state agency purchasing cards, income tax refund fund, subsidies for assistant state's attorneys for the prosecution of alcohol-related traffic offenses, and other substantive changes necessary to implement the FY 2001 budget for the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4374?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, appears House Bill 4433(sic-4435) Senate Amendments #1 and
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  This is part of the Fiscal Year 2001 appropriation. This will come to us for a vote in several pieces. This is the piece that proposes that we spend money for education. It has money for the foundation levels that were established by law several years ago under Governor Edgar. It fully funds the 'hold harmless'... I'm sorry, the categoricals

2. Representative Hannig. On Senate Amendments #1 and..."

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

for the second year in a row, the hold harmless money that was also spelled out in the Bill, under Governor Edgar, three years ago is funded. Teachers retirements and health insurance are funded. The State Board of Education's programs and operations are included in this budget. also includes a new... includes more money for schools in the area of a average daily attendance grant that would go to public schools only, that's in the amount of \$68 million. That was not in the Governor's initial proposal, but it's in this budget. Higher education will receive \$136.9 million, basically, everything that the higher ed community asked for. The total contribution is 53%. That is education will account for 53% of new funding, \$466.9 million. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd move that the House concur in the Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just make a statement, and I really think that I'm going to support this piece of legislation. I think that we have to do what's right and good for education. But, I'm still very concerned that we're doing nothing about the disparity in education funding from the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. And I think in the very near future we're going to have to address this issue, and every child in this state has got to expect and demand of us, the Legislative Body who has responsibility for ensuring that every child has a chance to succeed in this world economy that we live today."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4435?' This is

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4435. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #3, appears House Bill 4437. Representative Hannig on Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This piece of the budget is the agencies that generally go through the Human Services Committee. It provides that the Department of Revenue have the \$280 million for Property Tax Program which we recently passed in this House as well as the \$35 million to run the Senior Citizens It provides that the Department of Circuit Breaker. Corrections would have sufficient money to move forward with the three institutions that are scheduled to open in It provides for 53 more parole agents. provides for additional money so that we can eliminate backlog that exists at this time with DNA evidence in the State Police budget. It also provides for two additional cadet classes which will put 43 new state troopers in the It provides for the state to take over the field. operations of the wildlife prairie park near Peoria. \$40 million for the Illinois Open Lands Trust Act which is the second year of a four-year program. It has, I believe, the biggest transportation budget in the history of the State of Illinois in the Department of Transportation. It has a significant number of programs in the Department of

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Commerce and Community Affairs. And provides a number of other items including significant money for our state employees to be assured that their health care will be provided for. And it provides for some additional money for our public TV; and as well as the Liquor Control Commission to do some grants to local governments to establish tobacco enforcement programs. So, those are the general highlights of the portion of the budget. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we had an extended underground debate for the last two days about whether we should appropriate money to sectarian organizations. In Section 812 on page 737, there's \$75,000 appropriated to Holy Cross Church. Could you tell me what that's for and where it's located?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Representative, could you repeat the question?"

Skinner: "On page 737, Section 812, there's \$75,000 for Holy Cross Church. I'm curious what this is for and where the church is located."

Hannig: "What was the page Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Seven-thirty-seven. About seven-eighths through the Bill."

Hannig: "Okay. Representative, it's a reapprop of a Member
initiative."

Skinner: "Where is the church located?"

Hannig: "Representative, it's a Member initiative that's reapproped from last year."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I don't mean to be repetitive but you have not answered the question."

Hannig: "Representative, it is not my initiative and I don't know

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

where the church is."

Skinner: "I was not aware that we were allowed to appropriate money to churches."

Hannig: "Representative, this is a reapprop, so it was in the budget last year in a line item. It was not spent. And we're reapproping it."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, my question still remains a valid question. We spent two days debating on how parochial schools should not get money from the state budget, and here is a \$75,000 appropriation, apparently to a church, not to a day care center to a church. I mean, it's like putting money in the collection plate it seems to me. And I'm curious to know where the church is, and I think that's a reasonable question."

Hannig: "You want to... Mr. Speaker, Representative Silva would like to answer the question."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Silva."

Silva: "Representative Skinner. Actually that grant to Holy Cross, they have a non for profit social service center, and this did not go in any way for religion, or the church, or what have you. It actually funded a program for young people who, in fact, are working their way towards becoming more productive citizens in that particular community."

Skinner: "All right. That's a good enough answer. On page 545, in Section 110, there's a disturbing \$600,000 refund to the Federal Government for low-income energy assistance. Why is the State of Illinois giving back \$600,000 of low-income energy assistance?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Could you repeat the question, Representative?"

Skinner: "On page 545, in Section 110, there is a refund... there are a series of refunds to the Federal Government, one of

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

them is for \$600 thousand for low-income energy assistance. Should this Body assume that the state whatever department... I presume it's a commerce department, that administers this fund, couldn't find enough poor people to pay electric bills and gas bills for, that we're giving back \$600,000?"

Hannig: "Representative, as best we can tell this is an overpayment that the Federal Government gave us, and we in turn must refund to them. I mean, it's a... the agencies in Washington and Springfield, oftentimes, as you know, work on assumptions and estimates, and they have to adjust the books at the end of the fiscal year, so."

Skinner: "Can you assure us that we're not forfeiting any money here?"

Hannig: "No, I don't believe that that's the case at all."

Skinner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative Hannig, does this Bill contain any prisons?"

Hannig: "Representative, there's money in this proposal for three additional prisons that the Department of Corrections, I believe, intends to open in Fiscal Year '01, plus the operations of the existing state prisons."

Davis, M.: "So, where are these three new prisons going to be located?"

Hannig: "Representative, the three prisons are the Lawrence Correctional Center which is scheduled to open sometime in the winter of the year 2000; the Illinois Youth Center in Kewanee which is scheduled to open in the spring of 2001;

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

and the Thompson Correctional Center which is scheduled to open in the summer of year 2001."

Davis, M.: "Where is that one, the Thompson?"

Hannig: "I'm told it's in the Rock Island area."

Davis, M.: "Representative. Representative..."

Hannig: "The Quad-cities area."

Davis, M.: "Is there a waiting list? I mean, do we have a waiting list for people going to prison?"

Hannig: "Representative, the director told us that if we would try to push back the opening of any of these prisons it could cause significant overcrowding in our system."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "Because of many other aspects of this Bill, I'm compelled to vote 'yes'. And yet, I have great hesitancy with my entire caucus for the simple reason that most of these prisons are filled with African-American inmates. The inmates are there usually for nonviolent crimes, petty street drug selling, and yet, the boat owners, the airplane owners, are never in Illinois' prisons. I was at conference this past weekend and different states told what they were known for. Illinois, the conferees decided, was becoming known as the Illinois Prison Index, the prison industrial complex. It appears, Representative, that we are using prisons as a form of economic development in the State of Illinois. I have a question Mr... Representative. Where is the vision, the planning, or the proposals to prevent and halt this \$130 million annual budget for prisons?"

Hannig: "Representative, the function of the Department of Corrections which is part of this budget is to incarcerate people who have been convicted of crimes. We have other

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

agencies, the Department of Human Services, the State Board of Education, and others who have programs that are set up to try to work with people, young people for example, as they go through, and hopefully, keep them on the right track. But, once they get into this system they've fallen off the right track."

Davis, M.: "Representative, that's true, but they also have a huge budget for substance abuse. They have a budget for adult basic education, and Acts to show you the vision, The adult basic education, the GED Representative. training, is like 11 million. For college in the prisons, it's like 1 million. I think the vision is off-track, and I think... you know, the department may bring us their budget, but I really think taxpayers are going to be, because I'm one of them, tired, fed up with this increasing big billion dollar budget for corrections in the State of Illinois. Crime is decreasing nationwide. Crime is decreasing in the State of Illinois, and yet, our corrections budget continues to increase. Representative, I know that's no fault of yours, but I'd like to send a message to the Governor. Please, don't come back with another prison building for next year. We don't need that State of Illinois. Let's bring in car t.he manufacturing. Let's bring in food processing. Let's bring in universities or research hospitals. But, let's stop this billion dollar increase every year for budgeting prisons."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Poe."

Poe: "Representative Hannig, I would like to ask one question.

The Department of Revenue, is there money in the budget for the guards, security guards that would be state employees?"

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Representative Poe, for bringing that to my attention. We did change the line item in the budget and move the money from contractual to personal services, so the money would be there for the people who are security out here at the Revenue Building in Springfield. We also had a commitment that all Members of the budget team heard from the Bureau of the Budget on behalf of the administration that those people would be kept, and that there would be no privatization of that security group."

Poe: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hannig, I just have a couple of questions. One, with the line of questioning that Representative Monique Davis asked you I did not hear a figure amount. Could you... Is there a figure amount on how much each of those prisons cost... those three prisons that you named?"

Hannig: "Representative..."

Giles: "I believe you said there was one..."

Hannig: "...are you asking..."

Giles: "... Lawrence Correctional Center, the Illinois Youth
Center, the Thompson Correctional Center."

Giles: "You can give it to me either way, or the whole amount of... it's going to cost to build those three prisons."

Hannig: "Representative, I'm told that the Illinois Youth Center in Kewanee will add a 60-bed housing unit at a cost of 4 million. The Illinois Youth Center in Rushville will add a 60-bed housing unit at a cost of 14 million. And a planning and construction of a medium-security correctional

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

prison will be \$6 million."

Giles: "Okay. And this is a bond authorization, Representative?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry. What is the question?"

Giles: "This is a bond authorization?"

Hannig: "No. No. This is not the bond authorization, but this is the authorization to pay the guards when the prison is open."

Giles: "Okay. So this... I'm looking at some numbers now. Now,

I get a better understanding, Representative. So, this is,

Representative, an increase of \$88 million or a percent
increase in their FY 2001 budget. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative."

Giles: "And, of course, along with, I guess, of the salaries or paying for the security or the guards at the prisons, this also funds 1,082 new beds. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, it funds additional new beds. And it also will fund 1,082 new beds as well as all the beds that are already there, Representative."

Giles: "Does this include operational expenses for those three new prisons? Is that in this, or is that something separate?"

Hannig: "This budget includes the operations of all the prisons that are up and running right now, and those new prisons that will open in FY 2001."

Giles: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Giles: "Once again, this is packaged in the budget, and this is something that we're all going to vote on. But, this is part of my long argument about money being placed on the backsides in our society. And when we have a tough time putting money on the front side, and that is trying to

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

educate the people of the State of Illinois, and especially our youth. And I truly believe if we would emphasize and put the resources towards education, and resources towards prevention, then we would not have to deal with these staggering numbers coming from the taxpayer's pocket on the backside. Mr. Speaker, thank you once again for allowing me to ask questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Mr. Hannig, there's some confusion about whether this budget includes the Department of Human Services budget?"

Hannig: "Actually, this piece does not, Representative. It's broken into four pieces, so."

Lang: "All right. So, that's in a different Bill. I just want to..."

Hannig: "That's in a Bill that's coming up."

Lang: "All right. Then... That's all right. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Hannig to close."

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

This is a portion of the budget that we need to operate in

Fiscal Year 2001. I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4437?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4437.

  And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rules report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Rules report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie,
  Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the
  following measure was referred, action taken on April 15,
  2000, reported the same back with the following
  recommendation: 'to the floor for consideration' a Motion
  to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2917."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1707?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1707 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Bring that Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Supplemental Calendar #3, appears Conference Committee Report on House Bill #4438. Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Representative Hannig on the Amendments. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Human Services' portion of the budget, and I would move that we concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. This includes some of the expenditures for tobacco funds including money to the Department of Aging for the Area Agencies on Aging for such things as Meals on Wheels equipment, Pharmaceutical Assistance Circuit Breaker Outreach Program to Seniors. Department of Public Health has 19 million of tobacco funds within for things like Youth Smoking Prevention Program, juvenile diabetes research, grants to local health departments for anti-smoking programs. There are also, within the budget contained herein, increases for: cost of living adjustments which increases to \$7 per hour personal care attendants effective July 1st; increases in the

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

nursing home COLA 2 1/2% effective July 1st which... at a cost of 48 million; hospital tertiary care, 35 million increase; home based support services an expansion in the enrollment at a cost of 1.6 million; 5 million extra dollars to community integrated living arrangements; and other monies within the human services area of the budget of the State of Illinois. I would be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While there's much in particular portion of the budget, House Bill 4438, to like and vote for, there are two portions of this budget that make me want to vote 'present' on this, and that's what I intend to do. First, the use of the tobacco funds. think we've debated that a significant number of times, in caucus, on the floor, in committee. I don't want to belabor the point of the tobacco money, it simply isn't enough for health care; there should be much more money in this budget from the tobacco settlement for health care. What I do want to discuss more seriously, though, this budget that deals with the Office of Mental area of Health within the Department of Human Services. vou know, I chair the House Mental Health Committee. Committee in a bipartisan way has worked for many years now to try to improve delivery of services to the mentally ill in the State of Illinois. As I've said on the floor of this House before, there are quite a few experts who believe that Illinois is in the bottom ten states in this country in providing services to the mentally ill. simply do not do a good enough job for the mentally ill. If they had expensive lobbyists here they'd be getting a

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

lot more money in this budget. In fact, the mentally ill are getting very little new money in this budget. Early in the Session the advocates for the mentally ill came to Springfield and told us that to even provide a minimal level of service they required 129 million new dollars. I think, less than 5 million new dollars They're getting, in this budget. And most concerning of all is the fact that the Inspector General, the office that's empowered to investigate abuse and neglect of our mentally ill in our state facilities and in our nursing homes, the Office of Inspector General which has reported over and over and over again to the Mental Health Committee that they simply do not have the resources or manpower to do the job the statute requires them to do is getting zero new dollars in this budget, a state budget of 46 and a half billion dollars, a surplus if you count the Rainy-Day Fund of billion dollars, and nothing for the Inspector General to make sure that our mentally ill are not abused or neglected wherever they may live in the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, this simply is not enough. I would ask, particularly, those on the Mental Health Committee to join me in voting 'present'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, can you tell me what happened to the Governor's introduced level for the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault?"

Ryder: "Representative, I do not know that there's a change in the budget from the Governor's introduced level."

Mulligan: "It was cut in half, Representative, from the

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Governor's introduced level. The amount that was the increase went from 1.2 million to a hundred thousand which And last year they received no increase. is half. sure that was not your fault, personally, but we just would like to be on record that that was not an adequate amount. think there are a number of issues with this budget this I feel that the shortened Session, it makes it very difficult for any changes significantly to be made either in how we provide mental health services or services to the developmentally disabled much of which needs to be discussed here in Illinois. And also, the fact that when we have hearings, if you're lucky you can go only one hearing per department when there are many people that would like to come in and discuss budgets, and have their concerns heard. I think for an abbreviated Session, it's much too difficult in human services to do a budget Also, I think it's very difficult at the end when we have many advocates coming to us asking what actually happened to the budget to handle it this way. And although I know there are many Members here, my name is on this Bill intend to vote for it. I do find that I did not think it was as good a way to do it this year and that, slowly but surely, we're backing off from doing a good job on how we examine these budgets, and how we should vote for And I would like to echo Representative Lang and them. some of the Members on my committee who also serve on Mental Health Committee were very unhappy about this. I'm personally concerned about the DD community. And what we've done to these people this year I think was not a good thing, and that we certainly need to take a good hard look for next year on how we handle them. I know we had some problems with changing the department secretary. We've got

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- a good new secretary, and I hope she'll work with that. But, I think this is a real problem on how we handled this budget this year."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Ryder to close."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the human services portion of the budget for the State of Illinois for Fiscal Year 2001. I urge your approval to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4438?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 8 Members voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4438. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rules Committee announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 3, on Supplemental Calendar, appears

  House Bill 4439. Senate Amendments #1 and 2.

  Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the portion of the budget for capital appropriations through the Capital Development Board. It also contains the awards approved by the Court of Claims of the State of Illinois. New appropriations to the capital projects is 1,093,000,000; reappropriations is 2,105,000,000 for a total of

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

- 3,198,000,000. I'd be happy to answer your questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."
- Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that has never had a committee hearing. We have never had an appropriation on the Capital Development Board in committee in Bill form. We have never voted on it. All of us know that the appropriations process is anemic to put it as mildly as I can put it. I am voting 'no' on this Bill, because it seems to me that the Illinois House ought to have more than one chance, on the House Floor, to vote for the entire Capital Budget of the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question... Representative Ryder to close."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... Senate Amendments 1 and 2 contain the Capital Development projects and the awards approved by the Court of Claims. I would seek approval that we concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4439?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4439. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rules report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'to the floor for consideration' Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 385; Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1707; and Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 390."

Speaker Hartke: "Supplemental Calendar #3, on Concurrence, appears House Bill 4582. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amends the Build Illinois Bond Act to provide for changes and authorizations of bonds. Increases the authorization for Build Illinois Bonds to 2,851,000,000. Provides that 2,029,000,000, or a decrease of 40,000,000, would be used for the expenses of issuance and sales of bonds, et cetera, for the making of loans or grants to local governments for city-related purposes. One hundred and fourteen million, 43,000,000, may be used for fostering an increase of economic development and increased employment. Provides that 5,559,000,000, or an increase of 38,000,000, would be used for the development and improvement of educational, scientific, technical, and vocational programs facilities in the expansion of health and human services for the citizens of Illinois. And finally, an increase of 20,000,000 to a total of a 148,000,650 authorization for preservation and restoration conservation οf environmental and natural resources."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4582?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4582. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And this Bill, having received a Super Majority, is hereby declared passed. Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, appears House Bill 4584. Senate Amendment #1. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 which becomes the Bill. And this amends the General Obligation Bond. It does require three-fifths majority and provides that the State of Illinois is authorized to issue, sell, and provide for the retirement for General Obligation Bonds of the State of Illinois at a total of 14,197,000,000, a decrease of a 198,000,000. The 6,078,000,000 total amount would be broken down between colleges, state prisons, conservation, health, child care facilities, veterans homes, agency buildings, water resource management, Secretary of State grants, local government, and new open land programs. addition, the anti-pollution funds would be authorized in the amount of \$262,000,000. I would be happy to answer questions on this authorization that requires a three-fifths vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4584?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Super Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, on Concurrences, appears House Bill 4587. Representative Hannig on Senate Amendment #1."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Before I begin, let me first thank the Chairmen of the Appropriations Committees and the Members who served on those committees for the fine work that they did as well as the staff that worked with us. And Representative Ryder and the Members of his side of the aisle that also put in a lot of hard work and long hours to get to where we are today. This is the final piece of the puzzle on the It's a Budget Implementation Act for the State Board of Education. It does four things: it raises the administrative expenses from 1 million to 1.2 million that the State Board of Education and the Capital Development Board may receive from the School Infrastructure Fund for administering that Fund. It makes the Summer Bridges Program subject to the block grants. It provides...it adds school report cards and criminal background investigations to the list of allowable expenditures from the School Safety and Educational Improvement Block Grant Program. And lastly, provides grants subject to а appropriation to qualified students pursuing additional certification or degree in an information technology field at a degree-granting institution. Each grant is an award of up to \$2500 per year. I'd move that we concur on the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Moffitt."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, just a question on the Summer Bridges

Program. You said it would make it a block grant. Is
there an increase in the total appropriation for the Summer

Bridges Program?"

Moffitt: "Over last year. Ten million over last year?"

Hannig: "It's 10 million more than last... than FY '00."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to echo the remarks of my friend, Gary Hannig, in thanking those who work on the committees, the spokespeople on the Republican side as well. A great deal of congratulations and thanks of appreciation to the staff who worked so hard to put together this budget. But, I'd like to make (applause)... Thank you, they deserve that. And if you will allow me one moment of personal indulgence, I would especially like to thank my friend, Ed Welk, who's provided to me a great deal of assistance and knowledge. A gentleman that knows this budget very, very well. Sometimes it's scary how well he knows the budget. But, we do appreciate the work that Ed does for us, and we want to thank him for that. And on my part, I especially thank him."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "I just move for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4587?' This is final

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4587. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, on Resolutions, appears House Joint Resolution 71. Representative Scott on the Resolution."

Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of t.he House. House Joint Resolution 71 seeks to rename several different roads throughout the state. And what it really does is that it incorporates a lot of Resolutions that have been introduced by various Members before. And I will briefly go through... there's 10 of them, and I will briefly go through them as quickly as I can. Renames Interstate 72, the Purple Heart Memorial Highway. That was a Resolution from Representatives Poe and Tenhouse. Renames U.S. Route 34, the Walter Payton Memorial Highway. That was by Representatives Cross and Persico. U.S. Route 40, the Historic National Road. Representatives Hartke and Granberg. Renames U.S. Route 30, the Historic Lincoln Highway. That was Representative Wirsing. Renames the bridge on South Chatham Road that spans Interstate 72 Illinois Route 36, the Thomas William Davenport and Memorial Bridge. That was actually introduced originally by Senator Madigan. Renames a part of Interstate 57, the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the Thurgood Marshall Memorial Freeway. Senator Obama. Renames the Poplar Street Bridge, the Mark McGuire Bridge.

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Hoffman and Reitz. Renames Interstate 74, the Veterans Memorial Parkway. Representative Tim Johnson. Renames the Interstate Highway 39 from its origin in Winnebago County to the Intersection of I88, the E.J. Zeke Giorgi Highway. That's from Speaker Madigan. And renames a portion of Illinois Route 50 from North Street to Larry Power Road in Bradley, the Kenneth P. Hayes Memorial Highway. That Resolution was from Representatives O'Brien and Novak. I'd ask for support of this Resolution."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Joint Resolution 71?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Joint Resolution 71, there were 114 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And the House Joint Resolution 71 is adopted. Supplemental Calendar #4, on the Order of Concurrences, appears House Bill 2917. Representative Holbrook on Senate Amendment #1."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. We'll try this again. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2917. It's just a technical cleanup. I know of no opposition to the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since I had expressed some concern to Members on my side of the aisle, I think I need to set the record straight. I appreciate Representative Holbrook calling this to my attention. I

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

thought he was asking for an excuse for a certain school district to not have to follow the average daily attendance audits and there was a ... we have on our side of the aisle a school that was just audited and has to repay a \$1.6 million because of an ADA incorrect calculation. As the Representative told me, this has nothing to do with the regular average daily attendance audits. It is for alternative education, and in fact, night school, right? So, given that assurance, I no longer have any concerns with the Bill and intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Holbrook to close."

Holbrook: "I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2917?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill ... or Senate Bill 1707?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1707 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much for your indulgence, and for getting this matter straightened out in a corrected form. I believe it's necessary to withdraw Amendment #1, then I

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

need to table Amendment #3, and then I would seek to..."

Speaker Hartke: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn."

Leitch: "May I move to table #3?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3.

Amendment #3 is... All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #3 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman"

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #5 simply mirrors what used to be Floor Amendment #3. We had previously adopted, but when we tabled Amendment #1 we had to redraft this. All this does is allow the Mass Transit District of St. Clair County to receive information from the Department of Revenue regarding vehicle transfers, so they can collect their fee for the Metro Link."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1707?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act amending the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I explained before, this enables participants in enterprise zones to

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

get the sales tax benefits of an enterprise zone when they purchase building materials outside of the jurisdiction in which the enterprise zone is located. In other words, opens it to a statewide possibility. And Representative Hoffman just explained the contents of Amendment 5. And I would ask for the adoption of Senate Bill 1707."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Representative Leitch is aware underlying Bill.  $\circ f$ concerns that have been expressed by building supply in my district, so I'm not in any way attempting to catch him by surprise or to ambush his Bill. I hold Representative Leitch in high regard, and I realize that with buyouts and mergers it's more and more difficult everyday to try and follow the original intent of the enterprise zone. But, let me just share... For those of you in rural areas or depressed areas, and I guess my district would qualify on one or both of those, intent of the enterprise zone Bill was to original stimulate economic growth and development. And the sales tax exemption, the intent clearly was that the materials for the construction or the economic development project be purchased within that municipality, so that you not only get the construction in the enterprise zone, but you get that turnover of money by purchasing the materials at sales tax exemption within that municipality or within that area. Now, what the underlying Bill does, and I understand the reason for it, it would allow a builder to go to a Home Depot store say in Lake Forest or Naperville or Aurora, get the sales tax deduction, probably it would be a builder of

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

a size to get a discount as well on the purchase, bring the material down to my area, and of course, build the project. And while we would like to have the project, and the underlying enterprise zone Bill has been very helpful to us in that, many of the building supply people in my district have expressed very legitimate concern that they will not be able to compete with the giant Home Depots... I probably shouldn't use names, but the giant lumber yards, and building supply houses that exist in more populated areas of the state. And so, it makes no sense to people in my rural area to promote on one hand a new building, a new factory, or even residential construction, and yet, let the purchase of the material go to someone outside immediate impact area. And again, I think I understand why Representative Leitch is doing this, because of the mergers and buyouts, and companies that operate dozens of plants all over the State of Illinois, and they may be adding on to a plant in an enterprise zone and they just as soon utilize a contract they might have in another area. I have no doubt that the Bill will pass as a measure of respect for the Sponsor. But I, again, I'm sent here to represent the people who send me here. I have heard from them and they have, I think, a very legitimate concern that this changes the entire structure and impact, positive impact to them of the enterprise zone. And they have respectfully asked me to vote 'no', and I will do so."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Actually, I had a question for Representative Hoffman, and I don't know if I see him on the floor. If it's appropriate, I..."

Speaker Hartke: "I think Representative Hoffman is not available

- 124th Legislative Day

  right now. Oh, here he is. He's returned. Representative

  Hoffman, would you yield to a question on Amendment #5? He

  will. Proceed."
- Stephens: "Representative Hoffman, I know we adopted your Amendment and I want to understand... We had... in the Metra East Mass Transit District, a limit or an exemption for automobile sales. And there's an agreement that we cap that at \$20 per transaction?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, this doesn't... Ron, this doesn't change that at all. The problem... What's happening is, because that was collected differently, the transit district could not get the records as to whether that was being paid. This will allow them to access those transaction records to make sure that it's being paid. The automobile dealers are okay. The Department of Revenue wrote the language. And I know of no opposition."
- Stephens: "The people who are selling automobiles in that area; there's no new tax? This is just a matter of reporting so that the transit district knows how many sales, and what the extent of those sales were? And there is a maximum of \$20 per sale, and that hasn't changed?"
- Hoffman: "This in no way... Whatever that fee is, I'll take your word that that's what it is; remember, we negotiated that?"

  Stephens: "Right."
- Hoffman: "Whatever that fee is, this does not change it. And the automobile dealers were in on the talks about how we can make sure we can collect it. And they all agree."
- Stephens: "I appreciate your explaining that, Representative."
- Hoffman: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I share

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

some of the reservations of the former speaker on this issue with respect to the underlying Bill. originally was that enterprise zone construction sales in an enterprise zone should be tax exempt. It was seen as a tool for economic development. The reality, however, is that all manner of people outside the enterprise zone have been able to qualify for the sales tax exemption by virtue of setting up short term shop or other useful addresses. And, in fact, they're already getting the sales tax exemption. It seems to me that the Department of Revenue is right, that it probably makes more sense just to say that the sales tax exemption will apply no matter where the construction materials are sold. So, for that reason I rise in support of Senate Bill 1707."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

Cross: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Hartke: "It's not unnecessary. Representative Leitch to close."

Leitch: "Thank you very much. And I do thank my friend, Bill Black, for sharing his concerns about this issue beforehand. The problem in Illinois very often is that the 'mom and pop' shops even aren't available in the enterprise zone areas. And as the previous speaker indicated, there are certain shams, addresses, store fronts set up to capture this. This Bill will straighten out a problem that's been throughout the state, throughout enterprise zones, and will make this whole system work a lot better. And I'd ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate
Bill 1707?' All those in favor will signify by voting
'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1707, there were 100 Members voting 'yes', 17 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1707. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk for an announcement."

- Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "Supplemental Calendar #4, on Conference Committee Reports, appears Senate Bill 385. Representative Monique Davis on Conference Committee Report #1."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Conference Committee #1 is in reference to Illinois Clean Energy Foundation. This Foundation already exists; the Governor appoints a member; and the General Assembly Leadership appoints Members; and these Members appoint trustees. What this Conference Committee does is it indemnifies state officials against liability for acts or omissions occurring within the scope of employment. And it also clarifies that the Members and the trustees or covered by this Act, and are, in fact, indemnified. The current law states that the Governor's appointee serves as chairperson. But, with this Conference Committee Report, the Governor can select any member to act as Chair of the Foundation, and that chairman will serve as chair at the pleasure of the Governor. I urge acceptance."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."
- Klingler: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reflect on the last vote,

  Senate Bill 1707. I intended to vote 'yes', and it was

  accidentally hit for 'no'. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The record will so reflect. Is there any

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

discussion on this issue? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Peoria, Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Slone: "Representative Davis, is this the... What organizations does this apply to? I'm sorry."

Davis, M.: "It applies to the Illinois Clean Energy Community Foundation. It's a Foundation, Representative Slone, that currently exists. This Conference Committee merely makes a couple of changes in this already existing Foundation. The purpose, Representative, of the Foundation is, it provides financial support and assistance to public and private entities for programs and projects that benefit the public by improving energy efficiency."

Slone: "Is this the Foundation that was created... This is the one that was created as part of the big utility Bill a couple of years ago, is that right?"

Davis, M.: "As part of the what?"

Slone: "The utility deregulation legislation."

Davis, M.: "No, I'm sorry, this is not."

Slone: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak. Phil Novak. Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Novak: "Monique, I know there's a new provision in here concerning the Governor's power to appoint a chairperson of the community trust. Could you read to me for the record

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

what line in this Conference Committee Report that refers to and what the words are? Because, when you said it initially it sounded like he could appoint the chairperson from anyone of the trustees that currently sit on the board, or is it that he does when a vacancy occurs his... if his vacancy occurs from his appointment powers, does it just apply to that person that he appoints? I don't understand."

Davis, M.: "It's on page 2, Representative Novak, and it's line 33, or let's say line 32. And it reads, 'The Governor shall designate one of the six voting trustees to serve as Chairman of the Trust or Foundation who shall serve as Chairman of the Trust or Foundation, at the pleasure of the Governor.' So, of the..."

Novak: "Well, okay..."

Davis, M.: "...voting members he can choose any of those."

Novak: "... Okay. I see it. Can I stop you right there?"

Davis, M.: "Sure."

Novak: "What does that mean at the pleasure of the Governor? Is that six months, one year, 30 days? I don't understand that."

Davis, M.: "What it means, Representative, is that the chairman serves at the Governor's pleasure. And the Governor does have the authority to remove the chairman at his call."

Novak: "Say that again, please."

Davis, M.: "The Governor has the pleasure of appointing the chairperson. And at any time during his or her tenure..."

Novak: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "...the Governor can pick a different chairperson.

The Chairmanship of the Foundation is serving at the pleasure of the Governor. Now, the difference is, it does not have to be the appointee by the Governor. You know,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

for example, the Speaker might appoint someone or does appoint someone. The Governor can select that person to serve as the chairperson if he chooses."

Novak: "Right. Okay."

Davis, M.: "And he can also let that person serve for six or eight months and then choose a different person. What the Bill says, 'It's at the call or pleasure of the Governor.'

The selection of the chairperson."

Novak: "Well, in the original law it said that the Governor had the authority to appoint the interim chairman until the board met and organized, and then consequently, elected a chairman. Now... So, in other words, this is going to take precedence over that?"

Davis, M.: "It will. This legislation says, 'That the Governor can choose the chairperson.' Now, in the past the Governor appointed a member, and that member was the chairperson."

Novak: "Right."

Davis, M.: "Currently, the Governor appoints a member; that member is automatically the chairperson. Well, this removes or abolishes that. This says, 'The Governor can choose any member of that sitting board to be... any of the voting members can be the chairperson.'"

Novak: "Okay. I understand that. And then, one last question.

And then, at his or her will, the Governor could remove that person as chairperson and install someone else, let's say 30 days later. Right?"

Davis, M.: "That is absolutely correct. The Governor will have the chairperson to serve at the Governor's pleasure. And this is in our..."

Novak: "Thank you."

Davis, M.: "...Conference Committee Report."

Novak: "Thank you."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage,

Representative Persico."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Persico: "Representative, I understand the aspect that you were just talking about, however, if the Governor then removes that person as chairman or chairperson, are they removed completely from the board or just as chairman?"

Davis, M: "No, Representative Persico, that person will remain a voting member and they simply will not be the chair at that time. The chairperson will change to a different person.

But, it does not remove that sitting member."

Persico: "So, nothing has changed in the sense of the appointees by the legislative Leaders or the Governor to five-year terms?"

Davis, M.: "Absolutely nothing."

Persico: "Thank you."

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hamos: "Representative Davis, why should we indemnify the members of this board? I mean, what if they give one of these grants... see, this board are going to be made up of private people who are going to give... \$250 million is what these folks control. They're going to obviously invest that and use the earnings of it every year for all kinds of grants. And what if we find out... I mean, what if, in fact, one of the appointees gives a grant to his brother-in-law or there's something going on that, you

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- know, is shady, or is corrupt, or is illegal. Why should we indemnify the members of this Foundation?"
- Davis, M.: "Representative Hamos, if any of the members are guilty of willful and wanton illegal acts or neglect, they are not protected under the Indemnity Act. They are protected under this Act when they are acting in good faith, and not acting illegally, or wantonly disregarding the public's interests."
- Hamos: "So, what kind of services to they receive when there is some kind of a negligent act that they perform? What kind of services do they receive from the state under this indemnification provision?"
- Davis, M.: "You say, what kind of service do they receive?"
- Hamos: "Do they get attorneys? Do we pay for their attorneys?

  Do we pay for their court costs of defending their actions,
  that kind of thing?"
- Davis, M.: "We would do exactly what we do for any state official who is now under the Indemnification Act. Whatever we do, if we provide legal service, if we provide financial service, we would do the very same for this group. We are simply bringing this Foundation members under this Indemnity Act."
- Hamos: "Okay, thank you, Representative Davis."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Davis to close."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you for those questions. And we ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 385?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

124th Legislative Day

- April 15, 2000
- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 385. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Announcement for the Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 15, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' House Bill 224 to the Order of Second Reading, and House Bill 4588, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Supplemental Calendar #5 is being distributed."
- Speaker Hartke: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Kendall,
  Mr. Cross, seek recognition?"
- Cross: "Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we're at a time when some controversial Bills are being called. Are you planning on calling the Jake Brake Bill tonight, or are you just going to let that one go?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Garrett."
- Garrett: "I intend to call this Bill again during the Veto Session. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hartke: "Page 3 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1281. Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1281 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Black, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

#1 contains some agreed language. McLean County Fair had expressed some concern about the ownership of land, and they may be cut out of some reimbursement and capital money. So, there's some language in there that removes the concerns of McLean County allowing a long-term lease rather than ownership of the property. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1281?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act amending the Agricultural Fair Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And thank you very much for calling this Bill. This is a county fair Bill.

We've just gone over Floor Amendment #1. Basically, what this Bill does, all counties who receive premium dollars, ag premium dollars from the Fair and Exposition Fund, and I can give you, I believe, there are 12 of those throughout the state, they will continue to receive the same percentage of funding as they did in Fiscal Year 2000.

Floor Amendment #2 was added by Majority Leader Currie, and that would allow extension 4-H groups to pay in cash a premium award or they could give an award of comparable monetary value such as a new Corvette or something like that. And I'll be glad to answer any questions you have."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Mr. Black, is this the Bill that you brought today in front of Agriculture Committee that we briefly discussed?"

Black: "Yes, it is, Representative."

Franks: "Okay."

Black: "The Amendment that we discussed this morning. That's correct."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just going to the Bill, briefly."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Franks: "I understand the rationale for this Bill, but I just want to point out one thing that's not good for those residents of McHenry, Lake and Kane County. Since we are being frozen at the same level as FY 2000, in my county for instance, McHenry County, we will lose approximately \$13,000 in additional funding. Kane County will also lose funding and Lake County will also lose additional funding, because this is based on population. So, those people that live in those counties should be aware of that. And for that reason only, I will be voting 'no'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Black to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1281?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 104 Members voting 'yes', 13 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

the House does pass Senate Bill 1281. And receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Rossi: "The House Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 4, on Supplemental Calendar, appears

  Conference Committee Report #1. House Bill 390.

  Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains three Bills that have passed the Illinois House that the State Senate did not see fit to pass back until this time. The first is Senate... House Bill 390 which allows a municipality which has part its territory within a park district, and is taxing its taxpayers for park purposes, so that there is part of municipality that is taxed, basically, double taxed. gives the municipality the ability to pay back part or all of the park tax. Secondly, the Bill allows until July 1st, 2001, by which certain territory may be incorporated as a village without having to comply with county planning requirements. Such territory shall not exceed two square miles in a county with a population between 300,000 and 350,000. Thirdly, House Bill 2902, which amends the School Code and Park District Code in Chicago Park District Act, with language regarding criminal background investigations. Fourthly, House Bill 4370, sponsored by Representative creates a new abatement category for Wojcik, which recreation facilities. It adds any property subject to a leasehold assessment that is used for a municipal airport, and which is sublet from a park district that is being leased, the property from a municipality. The property must be used exclusively for recreational facilities or for parking lots exclusively for those facilities. If there

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

are questions, we'll try to find somebody to answer them." Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik. Representative no one is seeking Wojcik. She declines. Since recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 390?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? There's still three people not voting. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 19 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 390. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar # . . . Supplemental Calendar #5, appears... on Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 4588. Representative Hannig on Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This is one last budget implementation Bill that we need to do before we go home this evening. All the items in here have been looked at by all four staff. They're just technical language to allow the government, our State Government, to have a bit more flexibility. I'd move for the adoption of... I move that we concur in the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of my friend,

Mr. Hannig. This does correct an oversight and puts us in

compliance with past practices. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Any further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1... concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4588?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question, there were 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4588. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank John Lowder, Director of our budget staff, Joe Hylak-Reinholtz, Chris Everson, Heather Loyd, Lara Thompson, Brandy Jewett, and Jason Daley for making this side of the aisle's budgets so very easy to understand, and working with the Members diligently. We thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 805, offered by Representative Shirley Jones; House Resolution 806, offered by Representative Ryder; House Resolution 807, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell; House Resolution 808, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell; House Resolution 809, offered by Representative Gash; House Resolution 810, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 811,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

offered by Representative McGuire; and House Resolution 812, offered by Representative Stephens."

- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie now moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we can have your attention. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. We are waiting for the arrival of the Adjournment Resolution from the Senate. But in the meantime, the Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the Members of your side of the aisle for your efforts and cooperation this Session. We have an awful lot to be proud of Members of the Illinois General Assembly. Tax relief, long sought after property tax relief package passed. course, we wish it was permanent, but happy with the one-time package. Senior Citizen Circuit Breaker. said earlier, we'll soon have the finest senior citizen assistance program in the nation. Earned Income Tax Credit, a great program, started as we all know by President Reagan, sorely needed by the working poor. And my compliments to the House Majority Leader who has worked on this for many years as well as Senator Jones. Education funding; 53% of new money; \$460 million more money going into the classroom, which I think is very important. agreement yesterday guarantees that \$80 million for an ADA funding which was 68 million in the '88 block grants, \$6 million each for textbooks and for transportation. In the area of health care and human services funding, \$150 million more for day care; 228 million more for hospitals,

124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

nursing homes, and various Medicaid rate increases; \$100 million for COLAs. Is everyone happy? Of course, not. But, we were able to address major That's not possible. areas of concern. And thanks to all of you for your help, and your support, and your hard work. A little bickering is okay with results like this. Have a great summer. personal thanks to you, Mr. Speaker. May you have a very happy birthday on April 19th. And also to all of our staff on the Democrat side, and of course, the staff that serves the Republican side of the aisle so ably and capably. My personal thanks to my Members for working so hard this Session, for the unity that you've always shown, and for the greatness that you show in representing the people that you do. And lastly, my thanks to a great Governor; a man of great vision; a man of dedication, honor, and a man that I'm very happy to call my friend. Ladies and Gentlemen, have a great summer, and thanks for a great Session."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #73, Clerk offered by Representative Currie, be it resolved by the Senate of 91st General Assembly of the State of Illinois the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn, the Senate stands adjourned until Thursday, November 9th, 2000 at 12:00 noon, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14th, 2000 at 12:00 noon. And the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Thursday, November 9th, 2000 in Perfunctory Session, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14th, 2000 at 1:00 p.m."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have

#### 124th Legislative Day

April 15, 2000

it. The Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would also like to thank all of you for your very fine work during this particular Session of the General Assembly. We all did well. My compliments to Mr. Daniels and the Members of the Minority Party. I would simply like to wish all of you a very, very restful, restful summer except for the Democratic targets. Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned until November 9 in Perfunctory Session, and then November 14. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned."