162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Rabbi Barry Marks of Temple Israel in Springfield, Illinois. Rabbi Marks is the guest of Representative Curran. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Rabbi Marks: "Source of life and blessing, Your power and might sustain the universe in all its vastness and complexity. Your love provides for all Your creatures. Your presence accompanies us always in adversity as in triumph, in times sadness as well as in joy. With the opening of this day's session, we pray for Your guidance. We ask for Your blessings of wisdom and strength. Renew in dedication and commitment to the well-being of this state and its citizens. Grant us the fortitude and perseverance master to the complex issues presented for our consideration. Help us to distinguish in our own conduct between principle and posturing, to respect the sincerity and good faith of those with whom we disagree, to seek out a spirit of cooperation and not to lose or sacrifice the good for the sake of the ideal best. Help us truly to promote the interests of all of Your people. keep us and grant us Your most precious gift, the gift of peace."

Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw - 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 McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Congressman Weller is excused today due to business in Washington."

- Speaker McPike: "And on the Democratic side, Representative Lou Jones is excused for illness. Clerk, take the roll. One hundred and sixteen Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Resolutions. Representative Giglio in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to make an announcement to remind the Members that are retiring, that if you'd like to talk to Mr. Kink from the Retirement Board and Doris Price from the Comptroller's Office, they're in 122B until 3:00 today."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 3459, offered by Representative Deuchler; House Resolution 3460, offered by Representative Giolitto; House Resolution 3461, offered by Representative Hannig; House Resolution 3462, offered by Representative Lindner; House Resolution 3463, offered by Representative Moffitt; House Resolution 3464, offered by Representative Clayton; House Resolution 3466, offered by Representative Tim Johnson; House Resolution 3467, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 3470, offered by Representative Tim Johnson; House Resolution 3474, offered by Representative Roskam; House Resolution 3475, offered by Representative Shirley Jones; House Resolution offered by Representative Kaszak; House Resolution 3478, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 3480, offered by Representative Stephens; House Resolution offered by Representative Granberg; Senate Joint Resolution 194, offered by Representative Tenhouse; Senate Joint Resolution 197, offered by Representative Hannig; Senate Joint Resolution 198, offered by Representative

162nd Legislative Day

Schakowsky."

November 29, 1994

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg moves for 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. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 3380, offered by Speaker Madigan, with respect to the memory Euguenia S. Chapman. Senate Joint Resolution 199, offered by Speaker Madigan, with respect to the memory of Cecil A. Partee."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Stephens. Representative Stephens. And Representative Granberg in the Chair."
- Stephens: "Can I have your attention for a few moments, please.

 We would...we have a very special announcement that we would like to make. House Resolution 3480,

 Stephens/Granberg. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Resolution."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 3480. WHEREAS, The members of this Body are happy to recognize the excellence of young athletes and wish to congratulate the Lady Knights of Mater Dei Catholic High School in Breese on winning the Class A State volleyball championship for the second consecutive year; and WHEREAS, The Lady Knights are ranked 19th in the USA Today National High School Volleyball Poll and are listed in the All-Time State Tournament Records among teams with the Most Appearances (10), Most Consecutive Appearances (5), Most Matches Played (29), Most Matches Won (16), Most Titles (3), Most Times Played-Top 4 (8), and

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Undefeated State Champions; and WHEREAS, Led and inspired by Coach Fred Rakers and Assistant Coach Monica Kuper, the Lady Knights are: Lisa Eversgerd, Laura Haselhorst, Henrichs, Julie Litteken, Kim Pingsterhaus, Diane Beckmann, Amy Henken, Carrie Hollenkamp, Lynette Schrage, Carmen Tebbe, Bridget Beckmann, Kendra Haselhorst, Krista Haukap, Andrea Linders, and Kristin Korte; and WHEREAS, Coach Fred Rakers has a record of 519-85 in 19 years of coaching at Mater Dei High School; and WHEREAS, The achievements of the Mater Dei Lady Knights confirm our belief that hard work and dedication are effective when you set goals and strive to achieve them; therefore, be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the coaches and team members of the Mater Dei Catholic High School Lady Knights and extend our sincere best wishes to them for continued success in the future; and be it further RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution presented to Principal Curt Winter, Assistant Principal Dennis Litteken, Athletic Director Dennis Trame, Assistant Athletic Director Marvin Eversgerd, Coach Fred Rakers, Assistant Coach Monica Kuper, and to each member of the team."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Representative Granberg and I who represent the area from which these girls come are very proud. I'm especially proud, because in the process of winning a state championship at the tournament, they didn't lose a game, and they beat Representative Brady's school at Normal, Representative Skinner's school at Huntley, and most of all, Representative Noland's school, Stuarts and Strausberg. So, we were very proud that we had...it was a Republican year in many ways, and we...I would now ask

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Representative Granberg to introduce Coach Fred Rakers.
Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, that doesn't mean it was a Republican year all the way, but thank you Representative Stephens. I am truly honored to present the coach and the team, because not only is...Mater Dei was in my district and in part still is, but I am a graduate of Mater Dei, which they do not like to admit. But you know you're getting old when you see these ladies around you, and they're the daughters of the people you went to high school with. So, with that, I would like to congratulate the team and coach Rakers, my old friend from high school, on an outstanding season. Truly a great achievement over the past two years, and they have done a tremendous honor to our area for all the hard work they have done and their dedication to this sport. And with that, Coach Fred Rakers. If Fred would say a few words."

Fred Rakers: "Thank you very much. It's a great honor to represent the Class A level of volleyball in Illinois, and it's also an honor to be here with the girls who helped get us here without losing a match during the season. So, thank you very much. We appreciate the opportunity to be here, and it's just a wonderful experience for myself and the girls. Thank you."

Granberg: "Did Ms. Henken want to say something? Ms. Henken, did you want to address the...no. Okay."

Stephens: "Thank you all very much. Ladies, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "The Committee on Rules has met, and pursuant to Rule 14(a)6, House Bills Amendatorily Vetoed, recommends consideration and the Bills be placed on the Order of Amendatory Compliance: Senate Bills 1200 and Senate Bill 1726; Signed, Frank Giglio, Chairman."

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Speaker Giglio: "...Resolutions. General Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 3489, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Giglio: "Committee on Assignments. Introduction and First Reading."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 4268, offered by Representative Prussing, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. House Bill 4269, offered by Representative Zickus, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of these House Bills."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoeft, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Hoeft: "Fellow Representatives, I would like to announce that my fellow colleague from Elgin, Patricia Reid-Lindner's birthday is today, and there are candles and...she has also made the commitment that she would like to take us all out to dinner tonight. So, please come down and make your reservations."
- Speaker Giglio: "Happy birthday. The House would like...make an announcement. The House will now consider Veto Override. So, those Members that are in their offices, would you please come to the Floor, and wherever in the building. The House is ready to do Overrides. Representative Brunsvold, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement on the Sportman's Caucus activities this evening. Would that be appropriate?"

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Brunsvold: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to...like to you to remember that the Sportman's Caucus reception is tonight, over at the Hilton at 6:00 p.m. We have a lot of prizes, silent auction, live auction, raffles, a lot of good items; fishing equipment, hunting equipment, clothing,

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

pictures, something Lou Lang would probably like to be involved in, and Lou will probably be there also bidding on some items, on a gun probably. I would like to remind everybody to come over, and especially like to have all the Caucus Members there, all 100 Members from the House and the Senate, we'd like you to attend the reception tonight. Stop over, look at the items, maybe bid on something, bring some friends along, and enjoy the night. A lot of food, and we'll have a lot fun, lot of activities going on at the Hilton. So, I'd like to see you there, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to make this announcement."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke, for what purpose do you rise?"

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to announce that citizens from the northwest suburban area are down here on behalf of concerns about Arlington Park, and they would like to have the Representatives from the northwest suburbs meet with them right after Session in Room 118. So, those Legislators that serve the northwest suburbs, if you'd be kind enough and listen to these citizens who have taken time to come down and talk to their elected Representatives about their issues. Appreciate it. Room 118, right after Session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would further like to announce that the House will be in Session on January the 10th, which is a Tuesday. We're raking in announcements, so those of you that may wish to want to make reservations for a overnight stay can do so, so the House will be in Session on Tuesday, January the 10th. On page 50 of the Calendar, Total Vetoes, appears Senate Bill 1369, and on that Motion, Representative Schoenberg. Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Speaker, we would request a Republican conference for up

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

to perhaps an hour."

Speaker Giglio: "We'll consider that request, Representative Leitch and I'll get right back to you. The Republicans request a caucus in...and the House will stand at ease until approximately 2:15, Representative Leitch. All right, the House will stand at ease until the hour of 2:15 for Republican caucus. The House will come to order. On page 50 of the Calendar, Total Vetoes, appears Senate Bill 1369, Representative Schoenberg for a Motion."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to move to override the Governor's Veto on 1369. Senate Bill 1369 essentially represents a win. proposition for all of our constituents. It has two major features of it; one is the senior citizens tax freeze which was featured in House Bill 410, sponsored by Representative Steczo and Senator DeAngelis, and another one relates to technology transfer to the enhancement of credit for university affiliated research parks. Αt this time, I would like to defer to Representative Steczo who can explain in greater detail the intricacies of the senior citizens tax freeze and why it is so advantageous for us." Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo." Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...thank you Mr. Speaker, Members House. A portion of this Bill, Senate Bill 1369, was language which we as Members of the House and General Assembly approved overwhelmingly and that was House Bill 410. And House Bill 410 was a response to things that I've been hearing from senior members in our districts for years and years, and that was that property taxes were threatening to remove them from their homes, threatening to take their homes away from them. response, we in the General Assembly last year, as part of

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Senate Bill 1369, as part οf House Bill passed...included a provision which provided that the seniors in our district who were 65 years of age and older, and who earned less than \$35,000 a year, would have their property assessments frozen. This to me, makes sanity out of current tax policies in the State of Illinois which discriminates a great deal against senior citizens living...living in our state. Where else would a state and a policy that provides that, you know, individuals after they spend their lives paying taxes and being citizens, and retire, and then all of a sudden, see their earning income drop. But even as that earning income drops, their property taxes continue to increase. That to me, is a travesty and probably one of the most unfair factors about the property tax system here in the State of Illinois. This is a Bill that attempts to correct situation. It's a Bill that attempts to address those same comments that we hear day after day, week after week, year after year from those same senior citizens in our district. Mr. Speaker, I would defer back to Representative Schoenberg to explain the remainder of House Bill 1369 (sic-Senate Bill 1369), but I will be happy to answer any questions related to that provision of this Bill during the course of the debate, and I would encourage Members of this House for this reason, on this provision, to override the Governor's Veto."

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

Schoenberg: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To underscore a point that Representative Steczo made, currently, all our policies within the State of Illinois, facilitate seniors leaving their homes, either voluntarily or involuntarily

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

and this is something which could do a great deal towards keeping senior citizens within their homes. As we well the State of Illinois' medicaid budget for fiscal year 1995, is going to be \$6 billion. It's one of unspoken truths in this state, that medicaid is primarily to serve certain limited populations within certain limited urban areas, and nothing could be further from the truth. We see increasingly, particularly in suburban and x-urban areas, how individuals transferring their assets so that they can avail themselves of...of medicaid. And this is something which would go a great deal towards reversing that trend, by keeping people in the homes that they have contributed to their community from...for a great number of years. As far as the other advantageous portion of the Bill, I would respectfully disagree with the Governor's Veto with respect to the research part components of this. This is a bold and timely step forward to expanding the state's revenue base by insuring that technology transfers the area the economy high tech is enable to grow and expand, so that we can be competitive with other states. We have discussed this great length already. The technical ver...the technical components of this break absolutely no new ground. very much the same things when it comes to the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Illinois Development Finance Authority, we do the same thing with the Southwest Illinois Development Finance Authority. We do use this mechanism as a way for government to steer and not row in the area of housing stock and economic development. I'd be happy to answer any questions relating to this, and I will refresh your memories that we voted for this Bill 111 to zero to 2 on the 12th of July, 1994. We made a

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

commitment to senior citizens and others interested in the economic vitality of this state that we were committed to this and I don't think that just because an election passes, we should forget that commitment. I believe that if we made a promise, we should keep it, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Wojcik: "Representative, I have a question that has been brought upon through a constituent of mine. Her husband happens to be five years younger than she is. If he should pass away with the tax frozen, or the assessment frozen, what will happen to that assessment? If the husband passes away who is the senior, and the widow is five years younger than him and it's frozen based on his age of 65, what will happen to that assessment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo or Representative Schoenberg. Steczo."

Schoenberg: "Representative Wojcik, in response to your question, and it is a very good question, but I would think that the law specifically stipulates that the freeze pertains to individuals 65 years of age and older who earn under \$35,000 a year. That would be the...that would...that would be the factor that you would use to judge, so a married couple would qualify. Once those circumstances change, unfortunately it would refer back to the way it was prior to the...the assessment being frozen."

Wojcik: "Do you know how long it would take before it is referred back to that?"

Schoenberg: "Well, you have to apply for this program on a yearly

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

basis, so the next year if one were applied, they would be denied or they just wouldn't apply."

Wojcik: "So, there is a bit of caveat in this Bill, that if you are, if you do become a widow or widower and your spouse is older than you, you quite possibly could go back to the original value...or the assessed value of your home."

Schoenberg: "That's potentially true, but keep in mind, however, that presently the law doesn't provide for a freeze at all, and penalizes every senior citizen no matter how old they are...how old they are or how little they make."

Wojcik: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, on page 187 of the Bill, as returned from the Governor, now there is a great deal more in this Bill than the information that has gotten all the attention. If you'll look on page 187, Section 90-95, we're changing the motor vehicle fuel tax law about displaying a valid trip permit. Given the recent action of the federal government in deregulating the trucking industry, can you tell what this Section now does to a trucker within the State of Illinois?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black?"

Black: "Yes."

Schoenberg: "This language, this particular language was inserted at the request of the Department of Revenue."

Black: "Is, is that language now needed and necessary given the actions of the federal government?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black, if indeed it is redundant, the next

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

revisory would excise it, but as I said, the Department of Revenue specifically asked for the insertion of this language with the anticipation of what the courts were going to determine."

Black: "All right. Okay. Let's...before I ask you questions about one of the more important aspects, perhaps Representative Hartke could enlighten us on the fuel permit. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, might be able to answer the question on the motor fuel tax section."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I think that Representative Black, and I'm not confident on this, but I think that the trucking industry will be required to file an annual report, and that would be tax information and the Department of Revenue sought to make those confidential reports. Now, in light of the ICC deregulation so forth, those reports are no longer required to be filed except for movers of household goods, and so, this would be pertaining to the household good movers, but other common carriers in the State of Illinois, this is probably not necessary. But, if...if I'm assuming that that's why this confidential..."

Black: "And the reason I bring this up, you and I know only too well, what a rather obscure law has done to our agriculture industry, and on page 187 of the Bill, underlined, it says, 'failure to display a valid single trip permit, when required by et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.' My theory is, that this Section may well beexpanded by rule as was the permit fee and escort provisions of a previous Bill, and it just will exacerbate what we're trying to work out

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

now on the implements of husbandry. And I'm just not sure what this language is talking about when it says failure to display a valid single trip permit and pursuant to the provisions et cetera, et cetera, as issued by the Department of Revenue. You know, the last thing I want to do is to get into some tax issue on an implement dealer that already doesn't like what we did last spring, and now we may be putting a revenue sticker on anyone operating within the State of Illinois."

Hartke: "Well, Representative Black, I think your point is well taken, however, I do belive that we could fix that real soon too in some other piece of legislation that would void those permits that you're talking about."

Black: "All right."

Hartke: "I don't think it's enough that you would want to not vote 'yes' on the override on this legislation."

Black: "All right. I just wanted to make sure we're on the same wave length. I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Another question of the Sponsor. The Bill also amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. Could you tell me how it amends the Illinois Vehicle Code?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo. Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "The other area that amends the Vhicle Cde, not only Lake County, but Cook and DuPage County to expand their motor fuel tax funds for bikeways with stipulation that the bikeways are constructed and maintained along county and state highways. So, what it does is, expand to DuPage and Cook County, a provision which already exists in Lake County for the expansion of bikeways."

Black: "Okay, I appreciate your indulgence. That's a very

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

important issue to me and I want to make sure that I'm right on this. It only allows them to utilize their county imposed motor fuel taxes for bikeways or does it allow them to get into what I consider the road fund dollars and do a switch from road projects to bike projects, bikeway projects?"

Schoenberg: "The first scenario which you outlined, is the correct scenario."

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "And the further version, and this goes on slightly further to go into a little more detail on what...right of way and other technical aspects on implementing this."

Black: "All right, thank you very much. Let me ask you now, my last question. On page 137 of the Bill, this is dealing with the senior citizens assessment freeze, on line 2 on that page, for taxable year 1994 only, to receive the exemption, a person shall submit an application by December 1st of that year to the county assessment officer, et cetera. That's Thursday. So, are we really dealing here in exercising utility or does this mean it's just simply puts it off another year?"

Schoenberg: "Essentially what we're doing to this Bill, is establishing a matter of policy and if, in fact, the December 1, 1994, deadline, is not timely, we're really looking at implementing this in the following year, yes."

Black: "Now, would it be..."

Schoenberg: "Or you, pardon me, or you have the option of changing the deadline. Either through the..."

Black: "All right, that's what I'm after. Who has that option?

The county board, the assessing official, who? The state?"

Schoenberg: "We do, Sir."

Black: "We would have to do that?"

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Schoenberg: "Yes, we would have to do that."

Black: "Would it be your intent that you follow this legislation then, to say...a May 1st of 95, what I'm getting at, if there's going to be some massive changes in assessment, is it your intent that this be done in the next three months or four months, or is it your intent to come back for it for fiscal year 95, payable 96?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black, it's my intention, and Representative Steczo concurs, that what we seek to do after we override this Gubernatorial Veto is, when the Legislature does return, to make sure that the deadlines featured in here are more uniform and that as I said earlier, is within our purview. It's something that we're going to do and not going to be done by any particular county board or any other local governmental unit."

Black: "Okay, thank you very much, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of Senate Bill 1369. I would like to point out a few indications to my colleagues of our history of what this Legislature has done dealing with property tax relief. Recall in 1991, we passed tax caps that applied to the collar counties. Also, in 1991, Governor increase in the homestead Edgar signed an exemption and the senior citizens exemption for those residents of Cook County only. For those residents of Cook County only. That Bill was signed, it wasn't criticized at all, so that in essence created a disparity between individuals that lived downstate. Last year in 1993, we passed overwhelmingly without one descending vote, a Bill

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

to increase the senior citizens and homestead exemption for everybody in the State of Illinois, passed it to the Senate, but the Senate refused to consider it. Now, I know there has been a lot of consternation and discussion about this Bill indicating that it is going to spread tax liability to other taxing groups. Ιf these situations would not have occurred, we wouldn't have all this talk about this. the Senate would have considered the Ιf Homestead Exemption Bill and sent it off to the Governor. he would have signed it. We wouldn't be here talking about this. The last time, and I would like to point out specifically, for my colleagues from downstate, Republicans as well as Democrats, those who live outside of Cook County, the last time there was property tax relief for was 1983. That's well over eleven years senior citizens, ago. I think the time is right now that we follow on this commitment for our senior citizens. Please support this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the override of the Governor's Veto. The Governor's Office and the Revenue Department have been injecting into the debate, that there's going to be a \$15 million shift of who pays...who pays what in the property taxes. Now, \$15 million sounds like a lot of money, so if you'd like to put it into perspective, which I would ask that you do, write down 15 and put six zeros after it. Fifteen million dollars. Now, then draw a line underneath it, and write down a ten with nine zeros after it, because the property tax burden in this state is \$10.3 billion. We're not talking in millions here folks, we're talking in billions. So, a \$15 million

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

shift is...represents less than a two tenths of percentage point shift in the property tax burden in the State of Illinois. That is so small, has to be close to a rounding error. Now why...I didn't use to be in favor of this idea, but two years ago, a senior citizen had me his dining room and said, 'Cal, do you know how many bedrooms I have?' I said, 'Probably three'. He said, you know who is going to be living there if I am going to be forced out of my house because of taxes?' 'Yes, probably some kids'. Well, if you figure answered, that you might have one child show up in a grade district, when a senior citizen moves out of town, in my town, that would mean that \$4,000 would have to be found to Thirty four hundred of those educate the kid. would be property tax dollars. My supervisor of assessment said this is going to cost about \$15 per senior citizen household. So, I would argue in contrary to the opponents of this Bill, that instead of costing local districts money, it is going to save them big time. they are going to save in my hometown, \$15 investment, \$3,385 in property tax revenue. This is not a Bill that is going to solve all senior citizen property tax problems, but it surely is not a Bill that is going to bankrupt any government in the State of Illinois. There's not reason to vote 'no' unless you aren't absolute positive purest. if you are, have a happy primary election."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Override Motion. I want to of course, concentrate on the senior citizens portion of this. Let's face it Ladies and Gentlemen, on the surface, it appears that this is not a great public policy. The

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

Bill sets up classes of Illinois citizens for some special tax treatment. It also shifts some of the burden The affect of the Bill would have on schools is others. however, it's clear that school boards have unclear, opposed the legislation because of some affect on their local revenue streams. Presumably, these are the reasons that Governor Edgar vetoed the legislation. We must to a broad tax policy for fairness to a reform of education funding so that the quality of education will improve and to equitable property tax relief for all. It is because we have not been able to accomplish these goals that I voted for this aid for seniors. This was a very close vote in my mind, however, my concern for a broad and fair tax policy was greatly tempered by my disappointment that our failure this Body to reach these goals. Since we have not tackled proper education funding along with real property tax relief, my responsibilities as a Legislator and yours relates to how to best aid your constituents. Seniors particularly have been hurt by high property taxes. Many seniors who have long since made the last mortgage payments on their homes, have called me to say, Representative Lang, I have to sell my home. I don't have a mortgage payment left, but I can't afford to pay the real estate taxes. What could be a more cruel and unfair tax policy than this. Seniors on fixed incomes who have contributed greatly to the growth of our neighborhoods and to our communities throughout Illinois should not have to lose their homes because of our unwillingness to tackle the problems of funding schools. Balancing the interests of all of our citizens, I believe the senior citizens property tax relief idea is appropriate. If we want to deal with tax fairness and or education funding, then it is necessary to decide to

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

take on all relevant issues at once. Proposed tax caps are not the answer, as they virtually guarantee a property tax increase. Real property tax relief requires relief. It requires real reductions. To do this in complete overhaul necessary of our entire tax structure. Our income tax system, our system of funding education and our property We and the Governor together must be willing tax system. to tear down the entire tax structure of our state and This construction requires fair completely rebuild it. taxes on both income and property and equitable education Because these goals will not be accomplished funding. anytime soon, the scale on this Bill tips in favor of the senior citizens. Even if flawed, it is only another piece of the puzzle that is filled with noninterlocking parts that won't fit until we resolve the entire problem. must help and allow seniors to stay in their homes, therefore, I urge you to vote for the override of this veto."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Either Representative Schoenberg or Steczo, would one of you refresh my memory as to what manner you're going to verify what the actual level of income is?"

Schoenberg: "The Department of Revenue is directed to establish rules and regulations within this Bill to determine what defines "income". My understanding is, currently is that the Department of Revenue is intending to use the same standards which are applicable in the case of determining eligibility for the circuit breaker program."

Mulligan: "And it's my understanding that this is suppose to go

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

into effect immediately."

Schoenberg: "Pardon me, could you repeat that?"

Mulligan: "It's suppose to go into effect immediately that you can apply for this December lst?"

Schoenberg: "Theoretically it's by December 1st, except as we discussed in debate earlier, because there is a minor snapfu with the deadline in the application. It's for us, the Legislature, when we return subsequent to this Veto Session, to establish new deadlines for when this program would be applicable."

Mulligan: "If you can't...or...if...in a criteria to establish what your level of income is not in place yet, how can it go into effect immediately?"

Schoenberg: "Well, as we mentioned earlier, the criteria which are most likely to be used and in which all indicators seem to point to, are those criteria for determining the eligibility for the circuit breaker program. But in terms of when the actual program is going to take place, because it is exclusively within our purview and not within the purview of any particular county or other local governmental unit, we will have to return to establish new deadlines and subsequent legislative Session. But in the interim, when we all vote to override this veto, I believe that will accelerate the process in which the Department of Revenue which already had a rather clear idea internally as to what criteria they want to use, that can begin in a formal basis then."

Mulligan: "Has anyone calculated what it would cost the assessor's office in each individual area to handle this problem?"

Schoenberg: "To date...all the calculations that have been made in terms of the impact and the cost shifting and the

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

implementation, they're all very rough and they're all very sketchy, and in specific response to your question, the answer is no, to date."

- Mulligan: "Can you tell me how many Amendments are on this Bill that had nothing to do with the senior citizens property tax? Would it be fair to say a good number?"
- Schoenberg: "There are...there are seven or eight depending on how you interpret it. I think it's a fair characterization to say that this Bill is a omnibus Bill. It does incorporate a number of different areas, not just relating to property taxes, but other revenue related matters."
- Mulligan: "An omnibus Bill because, obviously it's very difficult to vote against a tax break for senior citizens, so we're discussing the senior citizens, but we're not discussing really in depth a lot of the other issues that were tacked onto the Bill?"
- Schoenberg: number...I "Well a don't think that that's necessarily a fair characterization. I think that if we look at the success ratio that existed within this past Session of the Legislature, the...those measures which passed, were those measures which were able to accommodate the various interests of people on both sides of the aisle. They were genuinely bipartisan efforts. On the tax portion of the Bill. Ι know that Representative Steczo along with Senator DeAngelis Senator Topinka, were very actively involved over a great deal of time putting together that component of some of the other related matters that deal with revenue, I know that Representative Kubik was involved. On matters related to the research park and the economic development enhancement, I worked very closely with Senator DeAngelis and Senator Topinka, the chief Senate Sponsor. I view

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

this, not like a christmas tree, beside the obvious reasons, but rather because, unfortunately, last time, the only way we could get things done sometimes, was to appeal to everyone's mutuality of interest in putting together a bipartisan omnibus package, and that's really what this Bill represents."

Mulligan: "I do support some of the other parts of the Bill, but I do have a concern when young people in my district call me and are concerned that they don't make \$35,000 or they'd like their spouse to stay home, and still be able to save for college and they're not getting that same break. And I do think that I agree with you, it certainly increases the success ratio of the Bill, to have the lead portion of it refer to the senior citizens which many of us would like to help in our districts. And although I will probably will ahead and vote for the override, I have a small problem with the fact that we are leaving out...significant reform, particularly for younger people who are looking at the beginning of their life and putting kids through college, saving for their homes too. Particularly if they have new construction and their taxes go up and we don't address that at all. How would we get rid of this if we decide to do overwhelming reform? I mean, then suddenly you're going to take this away and do the overwhelming reform?"

Schoenberg: "Well, the roads to change Representative Mulligan are sometimes paved incremently and someone who is not only a first-time home owner and understands the situation which you just outlined as well as somebody who shares your position on property tax caps for suburban Cook County, I am very much aware of this, but as I said in my opening remarks, we need to find ways to keep people in their

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

homes, because people, for a variety of reasons through public policy, are leaving their homes because it's disadvantageous for them and they're benefiting from other government policies which in the end are even more costly. So, I do share your concerns, and it's my hope that we can continue to work together in the next Session in a bipartisan fashion to deal with some of these issues in a more comprehensive fashion."

Mulligan: "I will be curious to see how this comes out as far as what the actual problem is to local municipalities and entities of government as far as shifting the burden. I do not think it's fair to shift the burden to younger people or perhaps women who find themselves single again in a home with small children with less income than that, will still have to be paying for that, and I hope we will be addressing that in the next Session."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "I have a question just on the senior citizens part of this, so maybe Representative Steczo...on page 135, the last paragraph, referring back to the spouse of an applicant. Do you read this Section to mean that if an applicant dies, there is only one year...or can this be read that as long as the applicant's spouse is living even though they may have died ten years before, that this property would still be...have the assessment frozen?"

Steczo: "I'm sorry, please repeat your question."

Biggert: "On page 135, lines 30 thru 34, it says that when the applicant is a surviving spouse, of an applicant for a prior year for the same residence for which an exemption under this Section has been granted, the base year and the

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

base amount for that residence are the same as for the applicant for the prior year. I'm going back to the question that Representative Wojcik asked about, how long this property would be in the tax freeze, after the death of the applicant?"

Steczo: "I think when Representative Wojcik asked the question, we tried to respond to that."

Biggert: "I know, but this in the statute, but I don't read it that way."

Steczo: "I'm sorry."

Biggert: "I don't read it the way that you answered it. It looks to me that this continues..."

Steczo: "No, I think this language refers to a different question about prior year. Representative Wojcik's question was for future years."

Biggert: "That's right, but this for taking the assessment based on the prior year's assessment after the applicant dies, will the spouse then be able to have the property with the tax freeze for more than one year? And that's the way that I read this Section of the Bill."

Steczo: "Representative Biggert, if she's qual...if the spouse would be qualified otherwise, yes."

Biggert: "All right."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, for the last time in my career, I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of moving the previous question, signify by saying say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the previous question has been moved.

Representative Steczo or Schoenberg to close. Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the last several months we have discussed this at great length, as I said

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

before, this is a win, win proposition. It enables senior citizens to stay in their homes longer and enables us to do things to jump start our economy in a variety of different ways that we would no longer be able to do if we hadn't done this previously. So, therefore, I urge your support of the Override Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1369 pass the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open, and this is final action. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner, are you seeking recognition, Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority, is adopted, and this Bill is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to announce on the House Floor that my seat mate, Representative Lou Lang, happens to be 45 years old here a couple of days ago, and we would like for you to join him the back chamber, Speaker's Lounge...or Speaker's Conference Room for a piece of birthday cake, and wish Louie a happy birthday."

Speaker Giglio: "General Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 3476, offered by Representative Kaszak."

Speaker Giglio: "Committee on Assignments. The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

162nd Legislative Day

November 29, 1994

- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On 1369, I was standing in the back of the room, and my switch failed to get pushed. I would have voted 'aye'. I would like to record to so reflect."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, let the record so reflect on Representative Hicks' desire to be placed on that...Senate Bill 1369, voting 'aye'. No further business to come before the House, Representative McPike now moves that House do stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 noon. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House now stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 noon."

REPORT: TIFLDAY	STATE OF ILLINOIS
PAGE: 001	88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
	DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

NOVEMBER 29, 1994

94/12/16 10:01:48

HB-4268 FIRST READING PAGE HB-4269 FIRST READING PAGE SB-1369 MOTION PAGE HR-3480 RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE SUBJECT MATTER	6 8
HOUSE TO ORDER SPEAKER MCPIKE PAGE PRAYER - RABBI BARRY MARKS PAGE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE PAGE REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR PAGE AGREED RESOLUTIONS PAGE DEATH RESOLUTION PAGE	1 1 1 2 2
COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE GENERAL RESOLUTION PAGE GENERAL RESOLUTION PAGE HOUSE ADJOURNED PAGE	5 6 26