135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their chairs. All those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the Gallery. The Chaplain for the day is Major Ken Reed, Commanding Officer of the Salvation Army Temple in Springfield. Major Reed is the guest of Representative David Winters. Guests in the Gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Major Reed."
- Major Reed: "Let us pray. Father, God, we come humbly before Your throne today with our prayers and petitions. We pray that You will grant us wisdom and direction for our leaders present here today. Father, we desire leadership in our state endowed with holy integrity and a dedication to the good of the citizens of our state. We would ask that You empower our leaders with righteousness and the desire that our nation be one nation under God, undivided. Father, we give You honor, glory and thanks this day. In Your name we pray. Amen."
- Speaker Daniels: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Winters."
- Winters, 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 Daniels: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative

  Currie is recognized on the Democratic side of the aisle

  for excused absences."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that

  Representatives Blagojevich and Martinez are excused today

  because of illness."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record shall so reflect. Representative

  Bost is recognized on the Republican side of the aisle for
  any excused absences."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that all the Republicans are here today."
- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you. The record will so reflect. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 116 Members answering the roll and a quorum is present and the House will now come to order. We are joined today by the Pleasant Plains High School speech class. The teacher is Mrs. Jane Brownback and they are the guests of Representative Poe. Would you please welcome them to Springfield. In the rear of the Gallery here."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Wojcik in the chair.

  Representative Lang, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Lang: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. We're wondering two things this morning on this side of the aisle. First, we're wondering if there had been any progress on the budget negotiations? We're supposed to adjourn tomorrow according to the Calendar and we haven't seen anything that even looks like a budget. So perhaps you could enlighten us and after you do that I'll ask my second question."
- Speaker Wojcik: "I think they are still discussing things.

  Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Is this the same 'they' you referred to yesterday, Madam Speaker? It's good that you're in the Chair cause this is the same answer you gave me yesterday. Is it the same 'they'?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "That is correct. It's those people.

  Representative Lang."
- Lang: "And as promised, do you now have a list that you could share with me privately of who's...those people are so that we could determine if there are any Members that have a 'D' next to their name in that meeting?"

135th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1996
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang, I believe it's all knowing.

  Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, let's go on to the second question. I see that

  Representative Moore is on the floor and we're wondering if

  she now has a report for us as to how the Senate's doing

  with their Ethics Bill?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Moore, do you have a message from the Senate? Representative Moore."
- Moore, Andrea: "No, Madam Speaker, I do not. I have not been over to visit with the Senate yet today, however, Representative Lang, rest assured I will be over and follow up with a report."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."
- "Well, I thank Representative Moore for that. Yesterday Lang: she said she would send me E-Mail, but I know she can't do that. So perhaps you could just paper airplane a message over to me or something because we would like to follow up on that. I don't think we're going to do very much this morning, so Representative Moore could go over there now and just check it out. As a matter of fact, maybe Representative Moore can scout out these budget negotiations and enlighten us on those as well, while she's out of the Chamber. Thank you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "See, now you just used that word, 'those'. On page five of the Calendar on the Order of Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 542. Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move to approve...to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 542. This was a measure that was a product of the Legislative Audit Commission. We discussed it on the floor a couple of weeks ago and passed it out unanimously. Be glad to answer any

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- questions."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggins has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 542. All those in favor will say 'aye', all those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 542 and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Wojcik: "On page four of the Calendar under the Order of
  Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 454. Representative
  Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House recede...refuse to recede from House Amendment 1."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg is recognized."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

  Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."
- Granberg: "Representative Rutherford, could you please briefly explain to the Body what House Amendment #1 contains, please?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I will, Representative. The underlying Bill, 454, came over to us last year. It's dealt with a number of provisions in obsolete law. The House has added an Amendment to it with additional obsolete laws to it and the Senate, through discussions, moved to nonconcur, and the reason for that was to eventually put it into a Conference Committee.

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

That's why we're going to refuse to recede. We're going to package all of the stuff up on the obsolete laws, common sense legislation, into a Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Rutherford, do you know what the Conference Committee Report might be used for at this point?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "The Conference Committee Report, either on this Bill or House Bill 3157, which was another piece that we're going to put into a Conference Committee Report, will be used for the obsolete laws, the common sense legislation. So it's my intent to use it for those vehicles. Now there will be potentially two Conference Committee Reports available to us out there. I anticipate using just one of those and whichever one would be the mechanics to allow us to get it through by the time we adjourn is what I intend to use it for."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative. To the Amendment. I don't believe we have a problem, but I would like to suggest to Representative Rutherford that this is common sense. Maybe we should use the approach on this when the Conference Committee is drafted. That has tended to be the position of this Body. Maybe we should include an advisory referendum on pensions for all state employees and maybe we should do an advisory referendum for gambling because we can't pass anything, so let's do advisory referendums. And I would urge Representative Poe and everyone to look at this very closely cause we can do these important advisory referendums on the state employees' pensions cause I know that the intention is to get the vote out, so let's try

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

that."

- Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Rutherford to close."
- Rutherford: "As there may be conferees assigned to the Conference Committee Report, perhaps the Democratic conferees would suggest that and we can discuss possibly putting that in the language. I would ask for a favorable roll call."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Rutherford has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 454. All those in favor will say 'aye'; all those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 454 and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Continuing on the Order of Nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 1414. Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and send this Bill to conference."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg is recognized."
- Granberg: "Thank you. If the Gentleman would yield.

  Representative Wennlund, could you just briefly explain

  what the...what the...what is contained in House Amendment

  #1?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will. Representative Wennlund."
  Wennlund: "Yes. The...Senator Geo-Karis sent over a Bill that
  would increase the amount, the maximum amount of bingo
  games from 2,300 to thir...2,150 to 3,150, for Lake County
  only. The Revenue Committee decided unanimously that it's
  been since 1982 that the maximum amount of bingo games that
  can be played be increased by two, which would increase the

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

maximum limit by \$1 thousand, and this House sent it out as amended with like 110 votes. He went over to the Senate and the Senate Revenue Committee didn't have enough votes to concur in the Amendment, so I'm going to put it back in Senator Geo-Karis's lap and let her decide what she wants to do with it. And if you want to argue with Senator Geo-Karis, you're welcome to."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg."

- Granberg: "Thank you. Thank you. So...thank you, Representative Wennlund. May I also suggest you might want to suggest to Senator Geo-Karis and maybe Representative Winters, we can do it...let's see, property tax advisory referendum nonbinding, since they just killed that Bill? So let's do another referendum because everything's dead. Thank you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none,
  Representative Wennlund has moved that the House refuse to
  recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1414. All
  those in favor will say 'aye'; all those opposed will say
  'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and
  the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to
  Senate Bill 1414 and the House requests that a Conference
  Committee be appointed. Representative Lawfer, for what
  purpose are you seeking recognition?"
- Lawfer: "Madam Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for a point of personal privilege to recognize the eighth-graders from the Galena High School. If they would stand and recognize...They're in a tour down here of Springfield and, so, welcome Galena eighth-graders."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Welcome. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report. Committee Report from
  Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on
  Rules to which the following Joint Action Motions were

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' to the House floor, Senate Joint Resolution #103 and to the Order of Concurrence House Bill 1014. Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Continuing on the Order of Nonconcurrences,

  Senate Bill 1696. Representative Biggert."
- Biggert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1696."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg is recognized."
- Granberg: "If the Lady would yield, would you care to explain to the Body what that might be?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will. Representative Biggert."
- Biggert: "Certainly, Representative Granberg. The Amendment was a change in the effective date of the Bill. And this really is a vehicle Bill, which is still something we would like to keep alive, either for the remaining part of this Session or the Veto Session, on the subject of Department of Children and Family Services."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Is there anything in the Bill, in the underlying Bill,
  that we need to have in immediate effect, though,
  Representative?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert."
- Biggert: "The underlying Bill was for...are requiring the

  Department of Children and Family Services to develop a

  report regarding out-of-state placements of children. But

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

we did pass Senate Bill 1661 which provides for that report and was sent to the Governor. So it's not needed for that anymore."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will let my seatmate,
Representative Dart, ask some questions with the permission
of the Chair, and I want to thank the Representative for
her time."

Speaker Wojcik: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart is recognized."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."

Dart: "Representative, what was the other Bill that was sent to the Governor's Office in regards to this?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "It was Senate Bill 1661 which extends the time for the Inter-agency Authority on Residential Facilities which was set to sunset on December 31st, 1996 and now has extended the sunset date to December 31st, 1997."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "This Bill here was going to require that they report, DCFS report to us annually, about out-of-state placements. Was that the exact language in the other Bill?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Not quite. It dealt with the Inter-agency Authority on Residential Facilities, but I believe, in presenting this...this Bill on the House Floor before, it was always intended to be a vehicle Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, I guess my problem is that DCFS has fallen on it's face for the 'umpteenth' time and they were supposed to report back to us about out-of-state placements a year ago

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

and still haven't done that. They were suppose to start bringing our kids back from out-of-state about a year ago as well. They haven't done that either. Is there any reason why we...you know, you want this as a vehicle, I like the idea of having them report to us because, frankly, they don't do what they're suppose to do, ever. And with these kids, they're a rather high ticket item for sending them out of state. Is there anything you've gotten from DCFS to lead you to believe that this Bill is not necessary because they're going to start bringing the kids back into the state or at least tell us how many there are and where they're at?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "I believe that in the Budget Briefing Book provided by the Department of Children and Family Services, it does have those numbers in there and what has been accomplished and how many children are being brought back."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "It has some of it, but the reality of it was they were supposed to start bringing these kids back into the state because of the expense dawn...and that was the commitment they had made and they had not starting doing that yet. Are they going to start doing that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "They have reduced the number of children that are out-of-state and we can get those numbers for you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "The reduction has been miniscule, Representative. You can get the numbers for me, but we all know what they are already and they're pathetic like usual. They were supposed to bring these kids back because there are problems for starters, but it's less expensive to do it in

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

our state and they failed to do that for the 'umpteenth' time. It's just a...an agency that's a disaster. I hope in your budget negotiations and...are going on right now, that you guys will do something with DCFS cause it truly is your problem when you exclude us from the budget negotiations like you have. So good luck with that, Representative."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Biggert has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1696. All those in favor will say 'aye'; all those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1696, and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Supplemental Calendar announcements, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Wojcik: "Continuing on the Order of Nonconcurrence,

Senate Bill 1465. The Gentleman from Jersey,

Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Chair. I would refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 and ask that a Conference Committee I'd be happy to explain what it is that we appointed. intend to do if that's part of the procedure today. The underlying Bill, with the Court of Claims, allows them to capture federal dollars for the Victims' Assistance When the original Bill was drafted, that would simply create the fund to be spent by the Court of Claims without our oversight. We wish to put it into Conference Committee 'as appropriated', so that the House and the and add, Senate, the Legislature, appropriates those dollars that are captured from the federal funds. It is not intention to do anything concerning the Hispanic Illinois

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

State Employees' language that was on there or the other, which I think deals with circuit clerk's training. That will be part of the Conference Committee. It's simply to appropriate the dollars rather than to allow them to spend them as a...without our supervision. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Wojcik: "On that Motion is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg is recognized."

Granberg: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "So, Representative Ryder, you indicated that would be its only purpose to add 'as appropriated', to give that authority to the Body and that's it. One last question, Sir. Do you intend to put Representative Klingler's pension legislation in this Bill, for the state employees?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "No, I do not."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Granberg. Representative Ryder has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1465. All those in favor will say 'aye'; all those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1465, and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. On the same order of business is Senate Bill 1544. Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1544 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Cook, Representative Dart is recognized."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, can you explain just why you want to delete the effective date on this and why we don't want this to do into effect right now?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "I think, as I mentioned when the Bill went out the first time, that this would become a Conference Committee in the event that we need it for Medicaid."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "So this all along was going to be a Conference Committee.

Do you know what it is that's going to be the subject of this conference?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "No, I don't."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Then, thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Dart, do you have further questions? Representative Leitch has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1544. All those in favor will say 'aye'; all those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1544, and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson in the Chair. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 825.

Representative Kubik has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 825. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1825 (sic-825), and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. I wasn't deliberately mumbling. If you want to check the transcript, it was Senate Bill 825, Sir. Yes, Sir, Senate Bill 825. Just as we've moved a number of others. On Supplemental Calendar #1."

- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Wojcik in the Chair. The Lady from Lake, Representative Moore. For what purpose are you seeking recognition?"
- Moore, Andrea: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to report that I went over to the Senate, as requested by Representative Lang, and did check on Senate Bill 1288. And as the Senate Sponsor had promised, it is in fact on the Order of Concurrence on the Senate Calendar. Thank you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Where is Representative Lang when we need him? There's a message from the Senate. In the Gallery we have some guests of Representative Wyvetter Younge from Mandela Elementary School in East St. Louis, Illinois. There's 95 students and parents. The Principal is Scott R. Randolph and the teachers that are here today are Braun, Cooper, Fleming, Brooks, and Smith. Welcome to Springfield. Clerk, on House Calendar Supplemental #1 appears Senate Joint Resolution 103. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a Resolution here to rename Northwest Highway, in an honorary sense, to Ronald Reagan Highway. This Resolution states that Ronald Reagan served as 40th President of the United States. He was born and raised in Dixon, Illinois, where he was active in high school athletics and community affairs. Reagan graduated from

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Eureka College in 1932, at which point he went on to become sportscaster. actor, Governor of California, President of the United States. Provides that part of U.S. Route 14, that is within the State of Illinois, is currently known as Northwest Highway, is designated as the Ronald Reagan Highway. We have received some concern about, you know, having to change all the stationery or the businesses and what have you, that have a Northwest Highway address. That is not a problem. This is just an honorary designation and it's not an official name change that would affect your actual business address. So that is not a problem. The only cost would be for the Department of Transportation to put up appropriate signs, as they see fit. I do want to kind of add on to this a little bit. You know, I grew up in Iowa. And after we got off the farm, and after we got a radio, I used to listen to Ronald Reagan broadcast the Cub game by ticker tape. Later, after I moved to Illinois, I was, of course, a Ronald Reagan fan. I was a delegate and an alternate delegate candidate to the National Convention. I was actually honored to be an Illinois Elector and cast a ballot for him after the 1984 election. I do recall that when he went to Hollywood, of course, Des Moines was where he lived. And they had article in the Des Moines Register, which kind of explained what happened to him when he went to Hollywood. And I do remember they were very upset with his sport coat and they had to get out the scissors and cut it and stitch it and make it really appropriate for the Hollywood scene. In any event, this is a very worthwhile honorary designation for a great American and I urge the House to support this Resolution."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson in the Chair. On

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

the question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative  ${\tt Roskam."}$ 

Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question for legislative intent?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will."

Roskam: "Representative Pedersen, it's your intention that this would not change anybody's address. Is that right? And that this is just, in fact, an honorary name?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "That's correct."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Roskam. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will."

Flowers: "Again, Representative Pedersen, I would like to really congratulate you on bringing this Resolution before us. I, too, have a Resolution to rename the Calumet Expressway after Bishop Ford and that Resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 98. And I would hope that you and other Members of the Body could encourage our leaders to call that Resolution because he, unlike Reagan, was not a President, but he was truly a great leader and respected by all nationalities. So, again, congratulations on your Resolution. And I will not talk about Resolution 111 because that's a different subject matter. But again, Sir,

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pedersen to close."

congratulations to you."

Pedersen: "Well, thank you, Representative, and I will urge consideration of the Bishop Ford Resolution. Be happy to do that and I guess we've covered this all pretty well, and I'd just urge an 'aye' vote for this great Resolution."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pedersen has moved for the

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 103. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and SJR 103 is adopted. Committee announcements, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Attention Members, committee schedule. The following committees will meet at 12:30. Judiciary for Criminal Law in Room 114 and Appropriations for General Services in Room 118. Again, at 12:30, Appropriations for General Services in 118 and Judiciary for Criminal Law in Room 114."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lopez. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Lopez: "I rise on a Point of Personal Privilege."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "State your point."

Lopez: "We liked the General Assembly to give a warm welcome to a school in my district, the Salem Christian School. You guys can please stand up."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Welcome to Springfield."

Lopez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lopez. Representative Lopez, on your Point of Personal Privilege we note that one of students from your class has an Orlando Magic jersey on and I'm very happy with that. I don't think I'm joined by a majority of my colleagues."

Lopez: "Yeah, we gave her a hard time. I said you can't be in the picture, you have that Orlando jersey on, but I don't think we want to make her take it off at this point. But she promises that when she gets back home she'll take it off."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Welcome, all of you, again, to Springfield. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention. You've heard the committee announcements and

135th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1996
- those committees will commence as scheduled at 12:30, and in the meantime the House now stands in recess until the hour of 2:00 p.m."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their chairs. Those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the Gallery. Committee Reports."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports. Committee Report from Representative Tom Johnson, Chairman from Committee on Judiciary for Criminal Law to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration', Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #2. 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 to House Bill 1249. Committee Report from Representative Biggins, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations for General Services to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration', Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1014."
- Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk McLennand: "Messages from the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1459. House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill #1664. House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1684. House Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1912. House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1122 and House Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 10 to Senate Bill 1780, action taken by the Senate on May 21st."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Concurrence on Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 1014.

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Representative Ryder on a Motion to concur."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2, so that we might finally pass this Supplemental Appropriation. I...would be happy to answer any questions for those who asked me questions during committee. I do have some written answers. If you want to come look at the written answers, that's fine, or if you want to ask the questions, I'll be happy to respond as best I can verbally. On those questions as well as any others, I'd be happy to answer questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Really...instead of having questions for the House. Sponsor, I want to outline the actions in the Committee General Services Appropriations. I presented myself to sign a slip for witness as a proponent because there's a very important project in my district, the supermax prison in Tamms, which has been delayed because of nonsense over a bonding authorization, political positioning, which now we find out can be taken care of out of the General Revenue Fund in cash, which all along we knew. But I wanted to testify in the that committee and not only was I denied to testify, but then as substituted as a Member on committee, the Chairman and Mr. Rutherford made a very hasty Motion to call the Bill before the other Members, besides myself, got to answer...ask questions and ran the Bill out of there. Now isn't that ironic. Here I am, who is in favor of the Bill, helping your party to get it out, refused to testify as a support on record, which is very important to my constituents. They know where I am, especially with all the political posturing going on. And I thought that each Member, elected Member, was a ad hoc

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Member of any committee and ought to be able to attend and listen and ask questions if they present themselves reasonably. And I think I'm one of those people that can do that. But I'm here to tell you it's a sad day when, as a Member of the Committee, not only a chance to ask questions, but you know what, it wants to make you be a Bill Black and maybe turn up the theatrics and say, look folks, here. I was denied the right.' But you know what? That's kind of stupid. I don't want to do that. We can calm down and be reasonable. What a sham, folks. This is unbelievable. A Supplemental Appropriation. A project that a Session before last that I was Cosponsor of, million, not knowing it would end up in my district. you know what? Grateful to this Governor and other Members that we do need those 300 jobs in an unemployment county of 18 to 22 percent. But here we find ourselves today, this is all. Four and a half million is delayed. Cost overruns was in the Bonding Authorization Bill and now it's grown to 13 million. If we waited it would probably be 22 But we won't build a school where my wife million. teaches, where it leaks in the classroom. But we'll support crime and all the sham that goes with it. Let's build prisons. We need the jobs down south. Sure do! folks, as a Member for 12 years here, I shouldn't be denied the right to ask a question in any committee. Rutherford, you follow in my footsteps several years and let me tell you something, if I'm around, you'll regret this day. That...it was not very professional...of Let's get down to anybody. It sure wasn't Christian. basic tacks and get this situation, this budget...I'd like to see a budget. The Supplemental I saw just a few moments before I was denied the right to ask questions. But you

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

know what, this process has brought something out in me that I didn't know I had. I hope it's a healthy situation for me. Let me tell you something, I'm going to be watching this situation very closely. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the courtesy to talk. At least you recognized me. But folks, this game isn't over and many of you ought to be ashamed and I know most of you are sadly...are sad that you were a part of it. But shame on you. Shame on you. Although, I'll still sing happy birthday for some of you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Phelps, I'll extend to you some time if you'd like to ask some questions of the Sponsor.

Do you have any desire to? No, Sir? Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Mr. Speaker...could we have a verification on this if we get to 60 votes?"

Speaker Daniels: "Sure."

Hannig: "And could I divide the question, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "If you would like. Further discussion?"

Hannig: "And to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, please."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Bill. Are you addressing Senate

Amendment #1? Representative Hannig."

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

Also to the question of the committee meeting."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig, I think Representative Phelps has stated that. We would be happy to entertain your questions on the Bill. Representative Hannig. Further discussion? Representative Lopez. Nothing further? Representative Lopez."

Lopez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have three questions for Representative Ryder."

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he'll yield."

Lopez: "In our analysis we see that there are...there's

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

appropriated for three cars for PTAB. My question is, who are going to be using those cars and for what reasons are those cars going to be used for?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, as you know, legislation has been passed that expands the responsibility of the Property Tax Appeal Board so that they may hear appeals from the County of Cook that requires an expansion of their current personnel. In addition, it requires that they have certain items of equipment including vehicles. These will be the inspectors and investigators who will then be charged with, in some cases, physically examining the property on which the appeal has been filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez."

Lopez: "Personally, working at the Cook County Board of Appeals and doing the research and doing the investigation, there was never a need for usage of cars. The Cook County Board of Appeals has never bought a car, though have cars that belong to the county. So that's one expense that I do not see that's necessary, but I'll move on to the next question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm sorry. I was referring to a staff person and I didn't hear your question and I apologize."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez, would you repeat your question, please?"

Lopez: "Yeah. The Department of Transportation is requesting a 16 million supplemental for the Bond Series B Fund. Can you assure me, for the record, that this money will not be used...or it's going to be used for the third airport in Peotone?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Ryder: "Representative, for the record, on the record, those bonds will not, I repeat, not, be used for a third airport in the Chicago area."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez."

Lopez: "To go onto the next point. The Supplemental Bill for the
Department of Transportation, there's an appropriation
close to \$16 million from the Road Fund to the Illinois
State Police. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I don't see a Department of Transportation Appropriation for Illinois State Police. I believe you're talking about a \$13 million appropriation in the Department of State Police. GRF..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez."

Ryder: "Representative, that's a GRF appropriation."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez."

Lopez: "Okay, real quick. Section 62, has that been eliminated or is that still on part of the appropriation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, you're going to have to define the question a little better. My copy of the Amendment goes to Section 35."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez."

Ryder: "If you could tell me the part that you're talking about I'll be happy to respond."

Lopez: "Representative Ryder, according to our analysis, according to our staff for the current budget, there's an appropriation of 15,792,000 from the Road Fund to the Illinois State Police."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez, you're referring to Amendment #1. Could you state the page and the line number? Representative Lopez."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Lopez: "What it does, it fails to cut out that section. That's the question, what fails..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'll be happy to answer that question. I don't believe that that to which you're referring was included in Senate Amendment #1, but the answer to the question is that there were monies in the original budget from the Road Fund to the State Police. Subsequent court action, as indicated, that was not the right thing to do at the time. The Amendment #2, which we'll discuss..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lopez. Your time's expired, but go ahead, Representative Ryder, could you finish the answer to your question?"

Ryder: "Representative, because of that court action we are now appropriating the necessary, which we believe is \$13 million, in order to make up for that amount. If that...and I believe that's the item that you are discussing, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Ryder, I think you just answered my question when you discussed that with Representative Lopez, but the GRF is for the court case, when the court ruled illegal the Road Fund diversion that took place in last year's budget. Now, is there still money in the State Police from the Road Fund, though, Sir, do you know, for that use?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, neither Senate Amendment #1 nor Senate

Amendment #2 refer to Road Fund dollars except in the

example that you just gave to make up for the court

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

decision."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. And this Amendment also contains the worker's compensation funds, Representative, to help the payment in those line items for our state employees. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it's approximately \$20 million in various line items. I believe CMS is 5 million and there's various other line items that contain a total of \$20 million dedicated to catching up some aged worker's compensation claims. It is our hope that by catching up, be coming on a more current basis than this, that we will then be able to be in a better position to settle rather than litigate worker's compensation claims. Perhaps be able to settle them a little quicker, in a manner that's more fair. until this time some of the big ones have always been subject to the dollars and unfortunately we haven't always been able to put the dollars there. This budget does do that and it's our hope that, not only will we see the payment of the old, but we'll also see an ability to not current revenues for older ones as well. It's difficult for me to be able to give a final estimation on that because I don't...I'm not able to analyze cases currently filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank Representative Ryder for his brief concise answers as always. To the Concurrence Motion, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Concurrence Motion. I ask my friends on this side of the aisle to support this Motion. There are only two items in this Concurrence Motion and that is to provide the worker's

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

compensation funds necessary for our state employees. many of you realize when the first supplemental passed in this Chamber, there were in fact reductions and we were not paying the worker's compensation for those people who work in our mental health centers - for those people who work in our prisons, they work in our correctional facilities, who are injured on the job for trying to protect our lives, trying to protect us from criminals and we shortchanged them with that vote. That's why a number of us, in fact, everyone on this side of the aisle did not support that earlier supplemental. I ask them to support it now. Secondly, with the Road Fund diversion, as my friend from Danville said, I guess I can predict because when we did the state budget last year, I got up on this side of House and asked my friends from downstate. I specifically mentioned Representative Jones, Representative Bost asked them to vote against the budget because it contained a 17 million illegal road fund diversion. That means million away from our downstate roads that we desperately need. That was an illegal diversion that violated the law of this state. We passed that budget. Unfortunately, we had to go to court and I was the plaintiff and my friends We won that lawsuit because it was an from downstate. illegal diversion. When it comes to fiscal integrity, should follow the law. Gas taxes are supposed to be used for roads and road construction and their maintenance. Lottery funds are suppose to be used for education. We deviate from it. It's not fair to the taxpayers. should follow the law in this Chamber. We should follow the law in this Body and we have not done so. I would hope my friends on the other side of the aisle would follow the law this year with the budget, would not continue to seek

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

road fund diversions that are illegal, would not continue to seek other legislative acts that are illegal and they will follow the law. I believe they followed the law in this Concurrence Motion. And I ask my friends on this side of the aisle to support it because we've actually had some input here. And the whole other legislative process in Amendment #2 and every other Bill that's almost passed in this Chamber, we have had no input. We have had no input into the budget. We have had no input into anything going on in this Body because you have drawn partisan lines. So on this Motion alone I ask my friends to concur and I ask them not to vote for concurrence on Senate Amendment #2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would withdraw my
request for a verification."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Ryder now moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Schoenberg state your point."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, my point of order is a request of the Clerk. In the Clerk's Committee Report, the Motion to concur for Senate Amendments 1 and 2, on three separate occasions, Mr. Speaker, there were different outcomes that were taken. I would like to know which of those outcomes is the correct outcome and I think it's very relevant considering we are considering for final concurrence Senate

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Amendments 1 and 2. So if the Clerk could let the Body know which of the three outcomes is recorded...as the official outcome."

Speaker Daniels: "This is final action on the Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1. Clerk will...is researching your Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who question. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, On this question there are 116 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1014. Senate Amendment #2. Representative Ryder. And Representative Schoenberg, we are researching your question. We will get you an answer before we go to a vote on this one. Representative Ryder on Senate Amendment #2."

Ryder: "Senate Amendment #2 is the actual Bill that we see before us. It contains all the language, some of which has been discussed previously on the House floor, some of which was discussed on Amendment #1. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this request, on this roll call I would ask for a verification. And if I might, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we saw on the Senate Amendment #1 an effort to do some things in government that we knew had to be done. We funded the State Police. We funded the worker's compensation that needed to be paid. I think we saw what we can accomplish together when there is a bipartisan effort to try to address the problems of the State of Illinois. We on this side of the aisle are not opposed to putting together a budget that serves the needs of the people of the State of Illinois. And Representative Ryder talked about a few of

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

the things that were in this Bill. But I think I need to point out to each and every Member of this Chamber that there's a \$1.5 million out of the Road Fund that would to a special project in Representative Doody's district. This was not part of any negotiation or any request by the Department of Transportation. This is what you might call 'pork' projects. We also see Representative Kubik and money appropriated Durkin from the Capital having Development Board, \$75 thousand for a police station. And then there's \$4,600,000 in there for a Lincoln Center here in Springfield. And then there's the question of supermax in Tamms. Three years ago we voted to spend \$60 million of taxpayer's money to fund that project and last year the administration was back asking for 4.5 million dollars in addition. In other words, overruns. This year, that amount has grown to \$13 million. So now we're looking at a \$13 million overrun on a \$60 million project. And lastly, there's а special appropriation for the Northeastern Illinois Area Aging so that they can have some additional meals served...hot meals served to the citizens of that area. Well, I'd like to see some in downstate Illinois, as well. I think there's other Members that would like to see some in the City of Chicago, as well. There is certainly other suburban areas that would like to see some of this additional money for their Serving senior citizens is a statewide operation citizens. for the Department of Aging, not just for one agency, area agency in the suburbs. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's an awful lot of special projects, a lot of 'pork' in this proposal to go to one Representative or another Representative. The Senate did take some of the monies out that had been put in originally from this House,

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

but unfortunately there still remains in my mind too many 'pork' projects for us to support this Bill. So I would ask Members on both sides of the aisle to send this Amendment back to the Senate and ask them to recede so that we can continue to fund the State Police, so that we can continue to fund worker's compensation, but that we don't waste taxpayers' money on special projects that were not in the budget and not requested by the Governor or the agencies. So I would ask all Members to vote 'no'."

- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, do you have a response to the inquiry of Representative Schoenberg?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Yes, Speaker. In regards, there were two. The Chairman read two roll call results. The first one was 640. He read that by mistake. He then read a second corrected as 800. The noise prohibited Representative Dart and Lopez from being heard or that's why their vote is not recorded."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Clerk's report and then I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question or two regarding the supplemental."
- Speaker Daniels: "You may address a point of inquiry if you would, Sir. Do you have a further point?"
- Schoenberg: "The point of inquiry to the Clerk and I think I speak on good authority since I'm the ranking Member on our side of the General Services Appropriations Committee. Mr. Clerk, there were indeed three roll calls, not two taken. In Mr. Biggins haste to engage in some premature articulation, he had...he had 6 voting in the affirmative and 4 voting negative even though...even though myself and Mr. Phelps indeed wished to vote in the affirmative. The second roll call which was taken reflected a 6 to 0 score

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

and that, too, was inaccurate. And final, the third, third recorded vote, the one which the Clerk indicates is the official vote of the committee. is 8 voting in affirmative, 0 voting against and 0 voting present. I'd like the record to reflect that Mr. Biggins, the Chairman, have to parenthetically say, having done business with him this entire Session, I found his behavior not only be extremely out of character, but quite frankly something that would have made Joe Stalin proud. Mr. Biggins voted in the affirmative as did Ms. Deuchler, Mr. Phelps, Miss Krause, Mr. Poe, Mr. Rutherford, myself, and Mr. Dart and Mr. Lopez each wished on all Mr. Turner. occasions to be recorded in the negative. I won't belabor the point of how the business was conducted in this committee because I think Mr. Phelps has made compelling point. What I would like to do is ask the Sponsor a question about the intergovernmental transfer. Will he yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Ryder, much of the...much of the house of cards upon which we wish to build our budgetary affairs for the supplemental appropriations and indeed for the fiscal '97 budget, is predicated on the intergovernmental transfer of funds which essentially utilizes the Medicaid budget for Cook County as part of our own and, therefore, qualifies for increased federal matching funds. In Senate Amendment #2 there is a \$72 million General Revenue Fund appropriation to capture that federal match, yet there is no indication of where the remainder, \$99 million, is going to be spent. Could you please clarify this issue?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it is my intention that the majority, if

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

not all of the IGT will be spent in the human service area."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Before I follow up on that question, Mr. Speaker, I believe my time had been proceeding while I was making my inquiry of the Clerk."

Speaker Daniels: "Was that a speech or an inquiry?"

Schoenberg: "It's a point of fact."

Speaker Daniels: "I'll give you another minute after this one expires."

Schoenberg: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "You're welcome."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Ryder, you say this is all going to be spent on human services. For which budgetary cycle will this be spent for human services? Like I said...like I mentioned to you in committee, I know that unfortunately the state's been very good at rolling over debt. I'd like to know how we're going to roll over this revenue as well."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, allow me to explain, if I can, the situation in which we find ourself. This...In this Appropriation Bill we spend the money. We have money to be able to spend for any number of reasons. One of those reasons is the revenues have been good. Utilization in the Medicaid area has been also good, meaning it's held stable or hit a plateau. We have done a good job of getting a federal match. All of that has contributed to the healthy situation in which we find ourselves, in which we can pay down our bills. Added to that is the anticipated receipt of revenue from the IGT. I believe that I was in error in committee when I suggested that we were spending IGT money in this Supplemental Appropriation. I was wrong and I

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

apologize to you for that. It was, however, because of the anticipated revenue from IGT in the future that allowed us to use available resources, prudently, to pay down Medicaid bills. So, unfortunately, in the treasury we don't catch a single dollar, march it through the treasury and say, now I'm spending this on human services. But I can clearly tell you from the..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder, you...Excuse me.

Representative Schoenberg, I'll give you a minute when he's

done with his answer. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "...That it is our intention to use the majority, if not all of the IGT money in the human service area."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "I'm sorry. Just so that I'm clear, Mr. Ryder, it's a little loud. You know there's been some public comment that has not necessarily come from this Chamber, to the Speaker's credit, that some of the intergovernmental transfer money would indeed be diverted to other purposes. I think Speaker Daniels is correct in his position that this money be used exclusively for human services. It is your...Is it your understanding that any of this money will be diverted to pay for anything such as an increase in funding for education or any nonhuman service budget line?" Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we are going to do our very best in order that the funds generated by IGT will be used in the human service area, but I cannot guarantee each and every dollar as it flows through. I believe when we are done, that you will find increases in the human service area that exceed the value of the IGT when you compare last year's budget to this year's budget."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg, this...one last

135th Legislative Day question, Sir."

May 21, 1996

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ryder, we have not as of yet seen the intergovernmental transfer enabling legislation before us. The question that I have for you is, are there any time constraints imposed by the Federal Government as to when these dollars have to be spent. In other words, is there any limitation that we have because after all, the last thing we'd want to do is find that we're rolling over \$99 million into another budget cycle and find that we're going to have to relinquish that, just as we saw that the 'granny tax' was subsequently ruled to be inappropriate? Are there any bud...are there any time constraints as to when this intergovernmental transfer money has to be spent?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I don't believe you'll see legislation authorizing the IGT because it's an intergovernmental transfer, an intergovernmental agreement authorized by the Federal Government and approved by the Health Care Finance Authority. It does not take legislation to do that."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Currie.

Representative Currie yields her time to Representative Schoenberg."

Currie: "I do, indeed. Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "You're back at bat again, Representative Schoenberg. New life. Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that by throwing you a compliment earlier I could have had a little more time without having to rely on the kindness of some of my colleagues. Mr. Ryder, while we...I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Ryder is exploring whether or not that there are time constraints imposed by the Federal

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Government. Mr. Ryder, are you researching that or do you have a better understanding of it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder. Excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, I apologize that I shortchanged your previous question. I did not intend to do that. I simply forgot and for that I apologize. understanding of the federal law, Health Care Finance Authority does not have time limits. As a result, intergovernmental transfer generates a certain amount of money. If that money is then spent in the health care area that is matched by federal aid, that would be separate and apart from the transfer itself. So to my knowledge there is no deadlines or time schedule for the expenditure of those funds. They could be, as you've alluded earlier, they could be spent for items other than human services. But once they are spent for human services, as I intend to do, then it becomes a claim for services rendered that is then matched by the Federal Government."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Ryder, to follow up on that point further. I know the last thing that any of us wish to do is engage in a budgetary shell game between fiscal years. However, if the \$99 million that's acquired from the intergovernmental transfer for fiscal year '96 is spent on human services in fiscal year '97, consequently, that would reduce the resources that were needed from the General Revenue Fund. What would those freed up resources be spent on?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, when you cross the imaginary line of a fiscal year, it doesn't reduce the dollars that are available except in that arbitrary figure we call the end

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

of year balance. The dollars are still there to be spent. The claims can still be filed to be reimbursed and the match from the Federal Government may come. So that I would suggest, Sir, in this situation it is more appropriate to look at the dollars over a series of months rather than the arbitrary boundary of a fiscal year. I understand that...I understand that which you are saying and I don't mean to demean that, Sir, it is just that the dollars are there to be spent."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen. Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Ryder. I know you certainly don't mean to demean anyone and I think that that's model behavior that perhaps the Chairman of the Committee earlier this afternoon could have emulated. It certainly would have been befitting of him, it certainly would have been appropriate. Mr. Ryder, in an earlier version of this Supplemental Appropriation there had been \$5 million designated to move...for moving costs for the Department of Employment Security. Are those...is that \$5 million still being requested within Senate Amendment #2?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Neither is there a request to spend the money or an appropriation to spend the money in this supplemental."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you very much for clarifying that, Mr. Ryder.

The Members had been apprised earlier in the session that
it was the intention of the Department of Employment
Security to arrange a lease-to-own arrangement for...to
purchase a building that had been appraised at \$5.9
million, to purchase that building for \$18.9 million,
financed over the 20 years with a price tag of about \$33

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

million and that \$5 million, indeed, was going to be designated towards moving from one headquarters to the other. I'm pleased to tell the Members of this Body that the Department of Employment Security has reached an accommodation with its current landlord and will be staying put, and therefore, that's a large reason why we won't be needing to throw away that \$5 million or the other money that was going to be designated towards this offensive project."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Deering: "Representative, my question pertains to the transfer...or to the additional monies for the Northeastern Illinois and Suburban Area Agencies on Aging. It's my understanding from one of my local area agencies last year, there was a lawsuit filed by the Northeastern Illinois Agencies wanting to shift some of the downstate funding up to Northeastern Illinois. I was under the impression that that lawsuit was settled without any transfer of funds or taking funds from downstate. Is this in an attempt to circumvent what the lawsuit did or what it tried to do?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I've been informed that that lawsuit had as a plaintiff the City of Chicago rather than the agencies that you suggest. The reason that these two agencies are receiving this supplemental amount is due to an error. Their budget contained the full amount of the dollars that they anticipated receiving. The budget did not allow them, so they had budgeted for meals that would be unable to be delivered. This will allow those meals to be delivered."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Deering: "Thank you, Representative. That does answer my concern towards that portion. As long as we can take care of these folks there, it's much needed. To the supermax prison. Can you tell...can you provide for us, the Members in the Body, what's caused us to run \$13 million over bid?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I think there's two reasons. One. is some unanticipated environmental concerns in the construction of the facility that we simply did not know about at the time or nor could we have known at the time the prison was started. In addition, the security element necessary for a supermax prison creates a cost that was not the original plan and those costs have led to part of additional dollars being needed to finish the facility."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Yes, I didn't quite hear your answer, but did you say because of additional security help or additional security factors in the construction of the prison?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I did not mean to sav staff or correctional officers. That's not included in this - with the exception that some of the security measures being created in this facility are for the protection of correctional officers and staff, and I believe that that has contributed to some of the costs of the overrun. although I would not want to indicate to you or to else that all of the...all of the extra dollars would be going for that. Some of it goes to environmental, some of it goes to simple cost overruns that may be a part of a project and some of it is to additional security measures that would be taken in the facility."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion, Representative Deering?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Deering: "Final question, Sir. Last year, when the budget was passed on a partisan roll call due to the fact that we didn't have any input, was 'two tops' instead of 'four tops'. The Governor signed the budget saying that this was a budget that can cause the State of Illinois taxpayers to live within our means. It didn't require any additional so-called taxes or user fees. Now we're looking at a substantial supplemental. Do you think that next year's budget will have these precautionary measures in place so we won't have to be forced to face this in the future?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I realize that when you asked the question that perhaps you thought that it might be one that might cause embarrassment. But I take the question as an opportunity to say that I am happy that we had the opportunity to do this supplemental because it means that the state is doing better than we anticipated, that we were so conservative on the amount of revenue that we're making more money, on behalf of the state at that same rate than we were before, that we were able to hold costs in such a way that we're paying off our Medicaid bills at a rate much faster than anyone thought. Rather than suggesting that there was something inadequate about the previous budget, I suggest just the opposite. This supplemental is a sign of our achievement."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a couple of..."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "My first question is when the analysis might end up on the computer?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Speaker, I could barely turn on my computer, much less know when the analysis went into the computer. I would be happy to ask staff when they put it in, if it's helpful to the Member or if there's a specific question, I'd be glad to answer that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I downloaded at 2:55 and there was nothing in there. It would seem to me appropriate that the analysis be in the computer before we debate the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Representative Ryder."

Skinner: "I downloaded it. It's not...it's not in my computer.

It certainly wasn't here before the Bill was called.

Representative Noland has a pet project to force the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to subsidize agricultural research at the University of Illinois. What has happened to that this year?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, that is not part of this supplemental."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "On page 81, Section 30, there's \$1.5 million to widen the highway or a street...No, 143rd Street, between I-43 and 45. Whose district is that in?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I do not know in whose district it is. I believe it's in the southern part of Cook County. There's several Legislators back there. This money is...this money is in an ongoing project in order to assure the completion thereof."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Why isn't it in the Department of Transportation budget?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "They do not share the priorities that I as a Sponsor of this supplemental do."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "On page 49 there's \$16 million for airports. Which ones and how much for each?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I believe that a large part of that goes to the commercial development of the Scott Air Force Base in Southeastern...Southwestern Illinois. I believe Scott is either in Madison or St. Clair counties. There is also some funds for the airport in DuPage."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Is the Racing Board Budget in here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder. Racing Board Budget,
Sir. Is that in there? Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm not aware of any Supplemental Appropriation for the Racing Board in this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The Circuit Breaker Appropriation is down \$750 thousand. Could you tell us why?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, that's...I think that calls for a transfer. The line that you're looking at and that's the reason for the number that you cite."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "It was on page 42. The University of Illinois Hospital is pulling an extra \$30 million out from the Department of Public Aid. It seems to be just for general hospital subsidy. Can you tell us why?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "No, it is not a subsidy. It's part of the

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

intergovernmental transfer. They are the folks that are accommodating us in order to generate the money."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you. We're not discussing 'COLA'S' for local mental health and DD agencies in this budget. Correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "In this supplemental we are not. In other places, at other times, we certainly are."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a pass through of federal dollars Title III that allows for retraining due to layoffs if the layoffs are created by foreign competition."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "By pass through, you mean a pass through from the federal government?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, by pass through, I mean it's federal
money that we then appropriate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I call for the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Ryder now moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1014. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 71 'aye', 45 'no', none voting 'present'. Does the Gentleman persist in his...he withdraws his request for a verification. 'ayes', 45 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1014 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We are joined today by Elder Childs, M. Ford, Bishop Little, and Mrs. Margaret Ford, and These church representatives from Sister Janet Oliver. throughout Chicago are the guests of Representative Mary Flowers. Welcome to the General Assembly. Thank you for visiting us. Introductions of Resolutions."

- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution #128, offered by Representative Meyer. House Joint Resolution #128, offered by Representative Currie. House Joint Resolution #129, offered by Representative Currie. House Joint Resolution #130, 131, offered by Representative Currie and House Joint Resolution #132, offered by Representative Jim Meyer. These are referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Concurrence appears

  House Bill 1249. Representative Johnson. Representative

  Johnson."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Tim Johnson in the Chair.

  Representative Johnson, do you have Motions to Concur?"
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. At this time I would like to move to nonconcur. Well, let's see, we're concurring here, but not in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4. We're moving to concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Now we discussed this in committee this

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- morning and I think, I'll be happy to answer any questions.
- I don't know if they wish to divide this question, or not."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Give the Gentleman your attention and all unauthorized personnel please retire to the appropriate spot. There's no Motion that I see to consolidate these and so do you want to restate the Amendments?"
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, what my intention here is, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the committee is well-informed of this, is to nonconcur in Amendments 1 and 8 and send to Conference Committee and then to concur in the balance of those Amendments. So I'm not sure how the Clerk wishes to handle this. Maybe Representative Hoffman..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative

  Hoffman."
- "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I think that what we need to do is, Hoffman: personally don't have any problem with us doing them all together on the Concurrence Motion. However, I think that we do need the Sponsor, for people who are going to be voting on this, the Sponsor to explain what is in all of the Amendments that we are going to be voting on to concur with. Now I understand and it's my understanding, this is whole idea of doing this in a assuming that the Nonconcurrence Motion is to get this into a Conference Committee so that we can put the Committee Bill, both Democrats and Republican proposals, together, as we out of here earlier."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The intention of the Chair is to proceed with the Motion to Concur in all the listed Amendments.

  And if the Sponsor would be so kind, would you go over each Amendment for the Membership and explain what each Amendment in which you intend to concur, does or affects.

  Representative Tom Johnson?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Johnson, Tom: "Okay, Mr. Speaker and Members, if I can just go through these briefly and there are a couple groupings here. Senate Amendments 2, 3, and 4 really deal with and clarify a previous Amendment which was part of 1249 dealing with the fitness issue and psychotropic drugs and I would be happy to answer any questions or Representative Durkin can answer those. But I think that there is no agreement on those issues."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Questions? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, I don't have any problem with these proposals and in Committee we talked about that and I think that these Amendments make the Bill much better."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move to divide the question. We have the right to do that. I appreciate your acknowledging that request because our staff is...will be discussing this with your staff because we believe there is a problem with one of the Amendments that we're attempting to address. So I'm asserting my right as a Member to divide the question and I would appreciate your acknowledgement of that request."

Speaker Johnson Tim: "Representative Granberg, notwithstanding Representative Hoffman's agreement to consider all the Bills in one, we will respect your Motion to divide the question. So we're now acting on Senate Amendment #2. Seeing no further discussion the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom Johnson, moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113

135th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1996
- voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1249. Senate Amendment #3, Representative Tom Johnson. Proceed."
- Johnson, Tom: "Okay. Senate Amendment #3, again, is a clarification on the psychotropic drug issue as it relates to fitness."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Amendment the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "There's no problem with this. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There ought to at least be an explanation of what the Amendment is and in each case, as we are considering these Amendments. I think the rest of us have a right to know what the Amendment is, what it does."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson, a brief explanation for the Lady from St. Clair."
- Johnson, Tom: "Mr. Speaker, if I may defer this question to Representative Durkin, as this was his Amendments, previously."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "With leave of the House, Representative Durkin on Senate Amendment #3..2."
- Durkin: "What we've done with this Amendment is that over the past year there has been a number of discussions as to what is the proper procedure which needs to be undertaken when a defendant raises the question of fitness, in conjunction, when the defendant also is taking some type of psychotropic drug. We've amended the language which we believe follows the recent United States Supreme Court Riggins vs.

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Nevada, in which we are stating that in determining when a fide doubt of fitness exists, the court shall consider, but is not limited to the following factors: Whether the defendant has taken any psychotropic medications, any aberrant behavior by the defendant prior during, or subsequent to the alleged commission of the crime, and any significant changes in the behavior or demeanor of the defendant during the pendency of the charges, any difficulties by the defendant in communicating with his court or counsel or others. This is language, as I've said, we've taken out of case of Riggins vs. Nevada, 112 United States Supreme Court Reporter, 1810. you know, under a fitness situation the defendant, to raise that issue...and he must...the whole crux of fitness is whether or not he can communicate with his lawyer and whether or not he understands the nature of the charges. We believe that this is a more thorough definition and I believe falls in line which I believe is the United States Supreme Court's definition of one of the appropriate factors which must be brought into light when a court is to determine whether or not a defendant is fit to stand trial."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "No further questions, The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' or 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1249. Amendment #4. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom Johnson."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment
#4 also deals with psychotropic drugs and I will defer to
Representative Durkin."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "With the leave of the House,

Representative Durkin for explanation."

Durkin: "Just once again is language which is consistent with the United States Supreme Court, Riggins vs. Nevada, in which we've amended the medication portion under the fitness statute, specifically stating that a defendant who is receiving psychotropic drugs or other medications under medical direction shall not be presumed to be incompetent to stand trial solely by the virtue of the receipt of those drugs or medications. However, if the drugs or medications raise a bona fide doubt concerning the defendant's fitness, which we had previously had defined, the court shall conduct a hearing consistent with provisions of Section 114-16. That is a fitness hearing. If such a hearing is held, the court shall consider, in addition to the matters which we had previously stated out, whether the medication will materially affect the defendant's demeanor. The substance of his or her testimony, his or her interaction with counsel and his or her ability to comprehend the trial. I believe that this is very important because there have been a number of disturbing cases which have come back from the Illinois Supreme Court, particularly, some very, very serious matters, particularly one in my district in which there was a double murder of two eight month-old babies by their father in which he had committed these terrible acts of violence out of rage. He was in the Cook County Department of Corrections taking a mild sedative. However, under the current law, that was not something that was brought up before the court by any of the attorneys

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

involved because it did not affect his ability to communicate with his attorney or his ability to understand the nature of proceedings. However, the Supreme Court stated that because this is considered a psychotropic medication, there should have been a fitness hearing raised. No fitness hearing was raised and the Illinois Supreme Court reversed that case and now it has to go back to trial. This was four years ago. A death penalty was reversed and I believe that this is a situation which is not very equitable for the system or for all the parties involved and this addresses those types of situations."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Amendment the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart. Proceed."

Dart: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, is there any provisions in this Amendment dealing with the Appellate Defender's Office?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Durkin in response."

Durkin: "Representative Johnson has been working on that part of the Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Okay, Representative Johnson in response."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Representative Dart, this also contains the putting out in terms of bidding out these appeals to take care of the backlog in the State Appellate Defender's Office and this was, as I understand it, basically the same language that we passed out of here on 1249 initially."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, there's been some concerns expressed about this provision, namely that the counties may get stuck picking up the tab for this, if in fact, we don't make an appropriation. Is that what would occur if the appropriation doesn't follow?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson." -

Johnson, Tom: "No, this does not localize it or does not change the state's obligation to pay for these things. Now, obviously, if the state does not appropriate the funds, which it's my understanding that we are going to be including funding of this program or this pilot program. If it doesn't, then of course that backlog is going to continue. But it does not change it to throw it at the local level."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "What is the price tag attached with this, though, did you say?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "I don't know that exact price tag. I think that we were talking somewhere in the neighborhood of 1.5 to \$2 million, you know, to try to clean this backlog up. And again, that's a 'ball park'. I'm not certain, but there will be a phase-in period of time here, too, so how much is necessary."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Okay. I'm sorry but there is no appropriation attached to this. Is that correct? As I say, the counties have been concerned about this. Where's this 1.5 million going to come from?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Well, as you know, Representative Dart, this deals with a substantive way of handling this. The actual Appropriations Bills would be part of the State Appellate Defender's request for appropriations in the budget which we'll be dealing with here, I would hope tomorrow."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further questions?"

Johnson, Tom: "That's if we can get this done today."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Dart: "Yeah. Do you have...we won't...obviously, we won't see the budget probably at all, actually. But do you have any indication that this amount of money is going to be contained in the budget? Because I know there is a federal court order right now dealing with the fact that we don't fund the Appellate Defender's Office properly and they're threatening to let some of these guys, murderers, rapists, they're threatening to let them loose if we don't come up with the money. Do you have a commitment of some type or do you have some indication from somebody that we're going to give the money for this Bill so that we can pay that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "I don't sit in the budget negotiations, but, yes,
this has been discussed in committee and I know the
recommendations were that we would try to appropriate some
funds here."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further inquiry?"

Dart: "No, my only concern as I said, is that is there anything in the Bill that would make sure that the counties don't get stuck with the tab if we don't fund this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative Dart, these appeals in the office is the responsibility of the state. This is not the locals that are paying for this."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "No further questions."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. I just want to pursue this area just a little bit longer. We all want to make sure that the backlog of

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

these cases is resolved but we want to make sure that the counties are not stuck with the tab. I know, Representative Johnson, that you are a major proponent on this floor of doing away with unfunded mandates. It seems to me, if we don't make sure that the counties won't be stuck with the tab, that we're providing an unfunded mandate to them. Do you have a comment on this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "This is not changing any of the current responsibilities of the State Appellate Public Defender's Office to handle the cases that they are currently handling. Now, if the Federal Court Judge decides that it's in the best interests that you handle it locally, I Federal suppose like many other things, the Judges determine what's in the best interest for taxpayers, and I would trust that that's not the case here and that we are in good faith attempting to deal with issue and I think that this is a good initiative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, Mr. Johnson, is it not a fact that the Capital Resource Center, which is part of the State Appellate Defender, does not have sufficient funds and has not had sufficient funds for many years to do it's job? How will we be able to continue to handle the appeals on these capital cases if we cannot guarantee the funds will be there to handle them?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, as you know this has been a building problem over a number of years. The Republicans are now totally in control here and we are going to tackle this problem and that's what this Bill does."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Lang: "Well, Representative, if you agree it's a problem, why not fix the problem? Why do we just let it hang out there - float in midair? Why don't we deal with the problem? You have a Bill here to deal with it, or tell me you'll have a trailer Bill to provide the money to pay for it."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "We're dealing with it, Representative Lang, and I think you've previously voted for this Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, the question of voting for this Concurrence Motion or not is not really the issue as far as I'm concerned. We all want to take care of this problem, but to pass a Bill with no funding is an empty exercise. Don't you agree?"

Johnson, Tom: "I think I've already responded to most of these questions."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Representative, do you know if there's going to be anything in the Budget Bill that we have yet to see that will provide additional money for the State Appellate Defender in the Capital Resource Center to take care of these cases?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "I've already answered that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang, further inquiry?"

Lang: "Well, I'd hate to make the Representative repeat himself even if no one heard the answer. I think that would be unfair. So, I guess he's not willing to answer the questions, Mr. Speaker, and if he's not willing to answer the questions, I guess maybe someone else can ask him questions that he will answer."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "With no further questions the Gentleman has moved for the...that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1249. Amendment #6, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment #6 deals with a hearsay exception as it relates to Grand Jury testimony.

  Again, this was Representative Durkin's Bill and should there be any questions they could be addressed to Representative Durkin."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no questions, the Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 1249. Amendment #7. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #7 adds a provision..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh."
- Pugh: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on, on that last
  Bill. You allowed no debate on that Amendment to take
  place and I think it is appalling and a travesty that the
  House of Representatives is run in such a manner that we

# 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

don't have the opportunity to debate an Amendment. We are elected to serve our constituents just like any other Representative in this General Assembly and I think it is appalling and a disgrace that you would allow for Bills to pass without allowing ample debate."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh, with all due respect, we looked numerous times at the board and at the respective desks. Apparently, at the time you were talking to staff and there was no indication here or anywhere else that your light was on. We're proceeding now with Amendment #7. Representative Johnson on the Amendment."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes. Amendment #7 clarifies hate crimes to take into consideration where the action involves other individuals or groups of individuals that somebody is married to or friendships with another and provides for an aggravating factor in sentencing if an offense is committed by reason of another individual's actual or perceived race, color, creed, religion, et cetera. So this is really a clarification and an expansion of our Hate Crime Law here in this state."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Is there a discussion on the Amendment?

  The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor describe what the clarification is?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield.

  Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, this provides that a person commits a hate crime even if the action is committed against another individual, a member of a group of individuals, or has an association with, is married to, or has a friendship with another individual or a member of a group of individuals or is a relative by blood or marriage. Provides for an

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

aggravating factor in sentencing if an offense is committed by reason of another individual's action or perceived race, color. creed, religion, ancestry, gender. orientation, disability, or national origin. also include another individual, a member of a group of individuals, has an association with, is married to, or has a friendship with another individual. And, Representative, I think this is really in reaction to a recent court case in which hate crime was perpetrated against an individual, white family, who happened to have the daughter married to a black and as an omission under our previous law, since the offense was not committed against the minority, itself, it did not constitute a hate crime. So, this takes into that consideration and clarifies that court decision."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further inquiry? The Lady from Cook,
Representative Monique Davis. Proceed. Representative
Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will."

Davis, M.: "You know, there's so much noise in here, Representative. I can't hear."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Yes, that's a good point. Your point is well taken, Representative. If we could give the Lady and the Gentleman your attention, if we could break up the caucuses and if all unauthorized personnel would remove themselves from the House floor, we could consider this and other Bills in a deliberate and responsible fashion. Your point is well taken, Representative Davis, so proceed. Proceed with your questions. Give Representative Davis and Representative Johnson your attention."

Davis, M.: "Representative Johnson, I understand that this Bill.

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

does it increase the penalty for a person who commits a hate crime? Could you kind of explain your Amendment?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "I think I just explained it. But you're saying, does it increase the crime? No, it does not or increase the penalty, no, it doesn't. It clarifies to make sure that when hate crimes are carried out, whether or not it is specifically against what used to be just a named individual of a minority group. Now if that person's married to a non-minority group and still a hate crime is committed against them, that's still a hate crime."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "To the Amendment."

Davis, M.: "Well, to the Amendment. I would really urge the Body to listen to the Amendments on this legislation, because they are seriously important and you may find something here you really don't want to support. Even though some of it may be very good, you may find some things here that are really harmful. And I suggest that we listen to House Bill 1249. Representative, how many Amendments are on this Bill?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Currently, I believe that there are 10 Amendments.

Actually, I think 9. One of them was stricken."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I just urge the Body to listen carefully to these Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you for your admonition. With no further discussion, the Gentleman Moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #7 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

open. This is final action. 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' or 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #7 to House Bill 1249. Amendment #9. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative . Tom Johnson."

- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, #9 is just a clarification of #7 that we just did. It adds the word 'property'. So it's not just the crime committed against the individual, but also the property. Evidently, the Senate forgot to add that in #7."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion the Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #9 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' or 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #9 to House Bill 1249. Amendment #10. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Senate Amendment #10 is just again a technical clarification and cleanup of Amendment 6 which dealt with the hearsay testimony of a Grand Jury that's been previously explained."
- Tim: "Any discussion? Speaker Johnson, Seeing none, the Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #10 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the who wish? record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', 0

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

voting 'no' or 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #10 to House Bill 1249. Representative Johnson, you have filed a Motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 8. Do you wish to proceed? Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang. Representative Lang on the Motion to nonconcur."

Lang: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Can we hear what's in these before we agree whether we want to nonconcur or not?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson on the two
Amendments."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Senate Amendment #1 changes our initial Committee Bill 1249 by removing two or three of the provisions that were in our Bill and adding several provisions from the Senate side. And it is...in discussing this with Representative Hoffman in Committee, it is our intention to nonconcur with this so that we can get the Bill back basically the way we sent it over to the Senate and get this in Conference Committee."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Bear with me, Sir."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed, Representative."

Lang: "I understand that there has been some sort of an agreement as to what will happen with this Bill when it goes to Conference. Are you in position to share that agreement with us?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Basically, Representative Lang, it's put it back in the condition, the excellent condition, that our House previously passed this thing out with except that it would

## 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

also add a provision that the Senate would like in here concerning provisions of boot camp participation. And that's about it."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

- Lang: "I would move to divide the question. We're prepared on this side of the aisle to support Representative Johnson's nonconcurrence or Motion to nonconcur on Amendment #1. So we would ask that the question be divided and we would stand in support of his Motion on Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Your request is granted. Further discussion on Amendment #1. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes. Just that the agreement is as the Chairman indicated. We want to...we've worked in a bipartisan fashion to get a Committee Bill. The reason we want to nonconcur and the reason we want it to fly through the concurrences is because we can then get to a Conference Committee Report and do something on a bipartisan basis that's good for all in this Body."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further discussion the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson, has moved that House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1249. Now, on Amendment #8, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm moving to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #8 as the provisions and Senate Amendment #8 will be contained in House Bill 3451. And that is how we're working these things out in Conference Committees, so there is no reason for it to be contained in this Bill."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Questions on the Motion to nonconcur? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pugh."
- Pugh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "It is to be included in the Conference Committee

  Report in Bill...in House Bill 3451."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh."
- Pugh: "And is it the identical legislation that we're looking at in this Amendment?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "As I understand it, Representative Pugh, these same provisions will be contained in 3451."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh."
- Pugh: "And the substance of the Bill deals with the 'farming out'
  of indigent court cases to the Appellate Defender's
  Office?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "No, it does not. That was contained in Amendment #4 which we have previously moved to concur on."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh, further questions?"
- Pugh: "So what does Amendment #8 speak to?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson, Tom: "Amendment #8 increases penalties for solicitation to commit murder when the person solicited is under 17 years of age. Provides that the Department of Corrections in consultation with the Department of State Police for tracking gang affiliations. Provides that the Department

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

shall identify all inmate gang members. of Corrections identify top leaders and shall take steps leaders from members of segregate qanq Segregation means complete prohibition of visual, contact and communication. physical Those were proposals made by Senator Cullerton and, again, those are contained in Senate Bill 34 and as I understand it, from the Department of Corrections, those are discretionary things with them."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "And these discretionary things are contained in House Bill 3451 or Senate Bill 34? You just stated Senate Bill 34."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "House Bill 3451. I'm sorry."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Dart. Proceed."

Dart: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, is it your understanding that these provisions are going to be in a Bill that goes to the Governor's desk or is this...are these provisions getting sent to oblivion?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "It's my understanding that they are ultimately going to be on the Governor's desk here."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for a Roll Call on this Bill, on this Motion here. To the Amendment..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Your request is granted, Sir."

Dart: "Thank you, and to the Amendment. I oppose the Gentleman's

## 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Motion and am in favor of the Amendment. This Amendment problem that we've all been goes at the heart of the reading about with Richard Speck lately and the prison system and the question about who is actually running the place, whether it's the prisoners or the guards or prison officials themselves. What this attempts to do is increases penalties for those who are convicted οf solicitation of murder where the person solicited was a person under the age of 17. Requires DOC to track gang activity of inmates, segregate gang leaders and to include gang information in DOC's annual report to the Governor. for the monitoring of unprivileged allows also communication among inmates. The provisions Amendment are at the heart of what the problem is with some of the antics we've been reading about and hearing about, whether it's from Richard Speck or whether it's from 'Gangster Disciples'. This is something I think would take a major step forward in making sure our prisons are actually run by guards and run by the wardens as opposed to run by the leaders of gangs. And I feel as if this is an Amendment that there has been never a time that we've needed it more than this. The provisions in here are doing what we need to do. We are putting prisoners in their place, that they're the prisoners, they're not the ones running the place. And we are going to put some semblance back into this prison system. So for those order reasons I strongly oppose the Gentleman's Motion. I would move to concur and I appreciate you've acknowledged the Roll Call because I just don't see why anybody would not want this Amendment go in."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further discussion the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson, has moved that the

## 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1249. Those in favor of the Motion vote '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 62 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1249. At the request of Representative Morrow, on the Democratic side up in the Gallery are a number of students from PSI Foster Care with Doctor 'Pandent', the Vice-President and Mrs. 'Certa', Director of Development. Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, announcements."

- Clerk McLennand: "Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Attention please! Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee is meeting immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Gash.

  For what purpose do you rise?"
- Gash: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like the record to reflect that on House Bill 1249 I would have...I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'no' on the nonconcurrence to Senate Amendment 8."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The record will so reflect. The Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."
- Erwin: "Thank you. I'd like to...the record to reflect ditto."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The record will so reflect. Committee Reports, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on

## 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Rules to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' to the Order of Nonconcurrence, Senate Bills #1122, Senate Bill 1459, Senate Bill 1664, Senate Bill 1684, Senate Bill 1780, and Senate Bill 1912. Committee notice. Attention Members, committee notice. At 5:00 p.m., Executive Committee will meet in Room 114. Executive Committee will meet at 5:00 in Room 114."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Could I have your attention. Supplemental Calendar announcements, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

  Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, under the

  Order of Concurrence, appears Senate Bill 1664. And on
  that the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens.

  Proceed."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. I would move to refuse to recede from House
  Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1664 and request a Conference
  Committee Report."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On that Motion the Gentleman Cook, Representative Lang. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, my light was on previously. If you'd recognize me after this Bill there was something I wanted to say, but it doesn't relate to the Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion on this, the Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1664. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1664. The

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Continuing on the same order of business, on Supplemental Calendar #2 on the Order of Nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 1684. And on that the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

- Leitch: "I move to nonconcur and ask that a Conference Committee..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Leitch has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1684. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1684 and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Continuing on the same Supplemental, same order of business under nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 1912. And on that, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."
- Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that we refuse to recede to this

  Senate Bill and ask that this be placed in a Conference

  Committee."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion, Representative

  Durkin has moved that the House refuse to recede from which

  House Amendment, Sir?"

Durkin: "l and 3."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "From House Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1912. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1912 and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Continuing on the same Calendar, same order of business, nonconcurrence, appears

135th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1996
- Senate Bill 1780. On that the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balthis. Proceed."
- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request the House to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 10 on Senate Bill 1780."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Balthis has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 10 to Senate Bill 1780. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 10 to Senate Bill 1780 and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Proceeding on the Supplemental Calendar on the Order of Nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 1459. On that the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."
- Klingler: "Mr. Speaker, I move to refuse to recede from the Amendments."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion, the Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1459. Apparently, there's discussion. On that the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates that she will yield."
- Hoffman: "Yes, could you explain the House Amendment #2 and why
  we're refusing to recede?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."
- Klingler: "Representative, the Amendment was the Child Sex
  Offender Notification and the Child Murderer Notification
  which passed this House last week."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "But what exactly are you wanting to do with this? Do

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

you want it to go into a Conference Committee?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Yes, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "And what's your plan when it gets to a Conference Committee?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Representative, the plan is that we need to have both the Child Sex Offender Notification and the Child Murderer Notification pass out of the Senate. The Bill for the child murderer had been in Senate Rules and as was this Bill. We had...they have not concurred and we now move to refuse to recede."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions, Representative?"

Hoffman: "If you were to recede, what would be in this Bill, if
 you did recede?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "This was the Bill, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman, further questions?"

Hoffman: "Well, this is...what I'm asking is what Bill came over from the Senate?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Representative, as I recall this is originally a Bill regarding criminal trespass to land from Senator Walsh."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Now, we're not going to see anything else unrelated to the notification because we...I personally think we've got to get that done and over with and let's get a Bill on the Governor's desk. You're not going to try and put some other thing on this Bill like eavesdropping or anything else on this Bill?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Representative, I've never added anything else to this issue. I'm trying to get this Bill through the Senate. I'm trying to get this through as a Sex Offender Notification and the Child Murderer Notification Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions, Representative?"

Hoffman: "Are you going to do anything in this Conference
Committee Report regarding insuring that sex offenders, who
have been released and commit the sex offense against
adults, that they have to...they have to notify the local
authorities or is it only still going to be children
victims?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "No, Representative, this is the Child Sex Offender Notification."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Representative, this is the Child Sex Offender
Notification Bill, which is the only notification Bill that
we have."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, many of us believe that, at least common sense tells us that, if we have...if we need a Child Sex Offender Notification Bill, we suggest make all sex offenders...make all sex offenders have the notification. The reason is, is I think that there are about 30 thousand sex offenders who are out there who will not be covered by your Bill. We'd like to expand it to make sure it covers all sex offenders who could perhaps be recidivous. I understand why you want to...why you're going to refuse to recede and I just hope that you make sure that your Bill does what you'd like to

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

do and that's stop the heinous acts that sex offenders commit, not only on children, but on everybody."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Motion, further discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates that she will."

Granberg: "Representative, didn't Senator Bomke have a similar Bill?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Representative, the Bill that was sent to the House which we passed last week, I believe on Wednesday or Thursday, we included six other criminal provisions and the Sex Offender Notification. However, that Bill of Senator Bomke's did not include the Child Murderer Notification. By having both Bills back in the Senate, it's an attempt to have the Senate pass both the Child Sex Offender and the Child Murderer Notification."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So we will now have two Bills in the Senate, one sponsored by you and one sponsored by Senator Bomke?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "That's correct."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Are you and Senator Bomke fighting again?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg, do you have further questions?"

Granberg: "To the Motion. I wish you two could get along,

Representative Klingler. Pensions, this. You know, you

ought to make an effort to work together."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Granberg: "Well, okay, we'll do this. This is fine, but I just hope you people from Springfield can work together. Thank

135th Legislative Day you."

May 21, 1996

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Klingler has moved House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1459. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1459, and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Continuing on Supplemental Calendar #2 on the Order of Nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 1122. And on that the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw, proceed."
- Cowlishaw: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refuse to recede from Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1122 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1122. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1122, and the House requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Committee notice, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet at 4:50 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet at 4:50 in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Resolutions. House Resolution #129, offered by Representative Granberg, is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Announcements."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

- Clerk McLennand: "The following...Executive Committee will meet at 5:00 p.m. in Room 114. Executive Committee will meet at 5:00 p.m. in Room 114."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could have the attention of the Members. Executive Committee will meet forthwith...It's the intention of the Chair to recess for exactly a half an hour to be back here at 5:30 p.m. I would suggest that it might be helpful if the Members would remain on the House Floor so that we can return exactly at 5:30 and get on with the business of the House and proceed orderly through the business that's before us. So, with that admonition, the House now stands in recess until the hour of 5:30 p.m."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution #130, offered by Representative Granberg, referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Report. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 375 and Senate Joint Resolution #98."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could have your attention, again.

  It's the request of the Chair that all Members remain on
  the House Floor unless you're meeting as a Member of the
  Executive Committee. I appreciate your courtesy and
  understanding in that regard. If all Members of the House
  could remain on the House Floor. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Members will please be in their chairs. The
  House will come to order. Those not entitled to the Floor,
  please retire to the Gallery. Representative Currie, for
  what purpose do you arise?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Although they were with us earlier

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

in the day, Representatives Julie Curry, Steve Davis, Jay Hoffman and Tom Holbrook are now excused for the rest of this Session day because they have official business back in their district."

Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Committee Reports."

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 375 and Senate Joint Resolution #98."

Speaker Daniels: "HJR 98 (sic-SJR 98)."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Joint Resolution #98."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk McLennand: 'WHEREAS, Bishop Louis Henry Ford spent a lifetime of service in the Church of God in Christ and contributed heavily to every area of church growth and development, which included major efforts to address the problems of senior citizens, the young and the disabled and to confront national problems of the homeless, education and drug abuse in 54 foreign countries and all 50 states; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford was called to the ministry and service of Christ in 1926, in 1968 rising to prominence in a key leadership position in the National Church of God in Christ organization;

WHEREAS, In 1937 he founded the St. Paul Church of God in Christ in Chicago, which recently celebrated 58 years in operation; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford became assistant presiding

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Bishop in 1972, which made him Overseer or Bishop in 30 jurisdictions, including central Illinois, and became International Presiding Bishop and Chief Apostle on April 5, 1990, which allowed him to travel extensively around the United States ministering and reviewing operations and facilities of the over 8.5 million member Church which has been named the largest Pentecostal Church and the 5th largest denomination in America by the National Council of Churches; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford was a much sought after guest speaker and appeared at numerous national conventions, state conventions, banquets, church dedications and anniversaries, and received many outstanding awards and citations, including the Charles Harrison Mason Award and the Church Federation of Chicago Leadership Award; he was honored by the Mayor of Chicago who named October 25, 1990 as "Louis Henry Ford Day", was presented with the key to the city by many other municipalities, and served as a personal advisor to President Bill Clinton; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford consistently engineered surges of new growth which included purchasing Chicago's oldest house and grounds, a city landmark, as the site of the St. Paul Church of God in Christ, major development projects of remodeling and refurbishing of the Church owned national landmark Mason Temple Church, reopening the Saints College, and establishing the Mattie McGlothen Home of Love and Hope Emergency Shelter for the homeless and battered women and children; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford throughout his life dedicated himself to the disenfranchised, the underprivileged and the powerless and served as a constant reminder of the importance of brotherly love - an example we all should

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

emulate; and

WHEREAS, Bishop L. H. Ford's contributions to American society will have an enduring impact on humanity well into the future and warrant a permanent public tribute; and

WHEREAS, Interstate 94, also called the Calumet Expressway, from Chicago's south side to its southern suburbs, is traveled by all ethnic groups and economic strata of the State, used by both parishioners and the beneficiaries of the good deeds of St. Paul's Church of God in Christ, and is an appropriate public improvement to bear the name "Bishop L. H. Ford"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that the part of Interstate Route 94 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways that is within the State of Illinois, specifically the Calumet Expressway portion, is designated as the Bishop Louis Henry Ford Memorial Freeway; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Illinois Department of Transportation erect appropriate signs, markers or plaques along the highway in recognition of this designation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Secretary of the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Bishop of the Church of God in Christ.'"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flowers, the House is going to stand in recess until the Executive Committee adjourns. We have just been advised that they are still in. So, as soon as that comes out, we will reconvene. So, the House will stand in recess until the Executive Committee adjourns. The House will come back to order. The Members will please be

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

in their chairs. Those not entitled to the Floor, will please retire to the Gallery. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Joint Resolution 98?"

Clerk McLennand: "It has been read in full."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flowers."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I would like to again give honors to Bishop Ford's son, Reverend Charles Ford, who is in the Gallery as well as his wife. Would you please stand recognition, please? And, Mr. Speaker, because Bishop Louis Henry Ford had a vision for a better world and an understanding and compassion for each individual within it, because he has served as an example to all of us as one committed to brotherly love, and because he lived a life of action in his advocacy for young and old and disabled and distressed, I, along with each Member or Sponsor of this Senate Joint Resolution 98, urge all Members of the House of Representatives to approve this measure today in lasting contribution to Bishop Louis Henry L. Ford. And I would ask for a unanimous 'aye' vote on this Senate Joint Resolution. Thank you very much, Sir, and I would also like to add all Members of the House to this Resolution."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flowers has requested leave of the House to add all Members to the Resolution. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Flowers now moves for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution #98. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This requires a Roll Call Vote since IDOT will be spending money. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

'present'. And Senate Joint Resolution #98, having received a Majority vote, is hereby declared adopted. Committee Report."

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report from Representative Stephens,
Chairman from the Committee on Executive to which the
following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken
on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for
consideration' Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 324 and
House Joint Resolution #131."

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #3 is being distributed."

Speaker Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. This is Mr. Elder Charles Ford and he would like to say a few words."

- Elder Charles Ford: "To Speaker Daniels, to the leadership of this great House, to every Representative, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. Bishop Ford spent his life doing things for others and today we've done something for him and his great memory. Thank you very much. God bless you."
- Clerk McLennand: "Messages from the Senate. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution: House Joint Resolution #71 together with Senate Amendment #1, in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House passed the Senate, as amended, May 21st. Also, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to Senate Bill #350, House Amendment #1 and has refused to concur with the House in House Amendments #2 and 3, action taken by the Senate May 21st.'"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "The House will come back to order, the Members will please be in their chairs. Those not entitled to the Floor will please retire to the Gallery. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Supplemental Calendar #3 appears House Bill 375, Conference Committee Report #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This report would recommend that the Senate recede from Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4, and that House Bill 375 be amended as follows. Essentially, what this would do would to delete all provisions with respect to the Interim Board of Review in Cook County. It would allow the Board of Appeals, the Cook County Board of Appeals, to operate until January 1...until the first Monday in December of It would add references to the Board of Tax Appeals and Property Tax Appeals Board section to the Property Code to allow PTAB to operate after the Board of Appeals actions. It would delete a provision allowing a taxpayer or a taxing district to request a review of an assessment. Stipulates that all Motions, the Board of Review and complaints by taxing districts, must be made or filed while the township books are open. Makes a number of other technical changes. I might point out that the technical changes that are being made in this Bill keep the property tax system at status quo as HB 1495 was passed last year, is no local government...there is no prohibition there against local government intervention in this Bill which was a concern that was raised by a number of people. The other provision that this Bill would have, would prohibit a township assessor or chief county assessment officer along with deputies or employees of those offices and boards of review and the State Property Tax Appeals Board from

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

personally soliciting campaign funds while the township or the county books are open. I might point out that the language is drafted in such a manner that these individuals would still be able to raise money, they would still be able to have political committees. It would just eliminate the personal interest in those issues. I think this is basically the Bill. I would move for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report and would be more than happy to respond to questions you might have."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There Currie: much not to like in this Conference Committee Report. Let's start with the basic underlying substance of the Bill that would rush property tax determinations in Cook County to the Property Tax Appeals Board starting January 1, 1997. stand with the Civic Federation of Chicago in opposing that proposition for the reason that it is likely to bring chaos and confusion to Cook County Property Tax Assessments and Collections. There will be great cost in this proposal to the residents of Cook County, costs that under the terms of this Conference Committee Report we refuse to reimburse. is estimated that additional costs to the Board of Tax Appeals will be in the neighborhood of \$2 million. the Assessor's Office will increase as well for every collections, month's delay in property tax local governments in Cook County will lose \$1.5 million in interest. Experts estimate the total cost, total cost to Cook County property taxpayers, as in the neighborhood of \$20 million. Now I'd remind you, Speaker and Members of this House, that many of you voted for a Constitutional Amendment that would prohibit unfunded mandates on

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

government. I would suggest to you that this is an opportunity to 'put your money where your mouth was'. you meant it when you said it, the only responsible vote on this measure, on that issue alone, is a 'no' vote. Speaker and Members of the House, this proposal will provide major new costs for us to pay for a Property Appeal Board, a State Property Tax Appeal Board, that today does not have the resource, the resources to do what we've asked it to do already. In fact PTAB has a current case backload of 1,000, 1,000 properties. The inclusion of Cook County at this time will mean a 450 percent increase in the Are you really prepared to put the money caseload at PTAB. And if you are prepared, let's put the money into PTAB, let them develop the resources so they can actually do the job. I am concerned that we will find confusion and chaos in the property tax system in County, a confusion that will not serve taxpayers well nor will it serve taxing bodies well. But finally, let me just suggest that there's an addendum to this Bill that I think is just an amazing proposition to come from anybody in this House. This measure would say that officials, assessing officials, local, county, and state, may involve themselves in no fund-raising while they are actually involved in the assessing process. I see no reason why we would single out assessing officials against others who have major issues before them, for example, us. For example, the Governor, when legislation is pending on his desk. No, no, no, we'll single out assessing officials and we won't say they can't take contributions from people who have matters pending before them. Maybe that would make sense, a conflict of interest. No, no, they can't raise money from Now for most of the assessing officials in the anybody.

### 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

state there will be some times of the year when they can. You know, during this month or maybe that other month they can rush out and raise as much money as they like, there is one assessing official, one assessing official and all the deputies of that official, who can't raise money at any time during the year. Not only can they not raise money, they can't go out to a fund-raiser, they can't have their name associated with any fund-raising enterprise. That individual, Speaker and Members of this House, is Tom Hines who just last week was appointed the coordinated campaign director for Bill Clinton in the State Illinois. For shame, Speaker and Members of this House. If we were being fair and evenhanded , we'd say Jim Edgar should stay home too, as he's the Chairman of the Dole campaign in Illinois. Oh, no, your proposal is only to say Tom Hines can't raise money, can't appear fund-raisers, can't put his name on an invitation for Bill Clinton. Well, Speaker and Members of this House, some of you pride yourself on fair play. Some of you say you're bipartisan. You're not just here to press for Republican Party perks. I would urge..."

Speaker Daniels: "Could you bring your comments to a close? I'm sorry."

Currie: "Thank you very much, I will. I would suggest, Speaker and Members of the House, that this is 'dirty politics' at its very worst. This is the kind of attack that surely will not withstand scrutiny in the courts. You're clearly interested in making sure that your guy is ahead at the end of the day. This is shameful, it's blatant politics, partisan politics of the worst kind. If you stand for anything, you vote 'no' on this Conference Committee Report."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "The Minority Leader of the House, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, simply to explain my 'present' vote. I plan to vote 'present' because of a potential conflict of interest."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion. The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I request verification if the Bill receives a requisite number of I'm joined by the requisite number my colleagues. I would ask so that you acknowledge that verification. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, it's a unique time when we're bringing partisan politics this close to home in this Chamber. Chamber's always been political at times, but never, I don't think, in the history of the House have we politics elevated or reduced to such a level as we have during the last year and a half, but particularly today. I speak as a Democrat, but I also speak as a downstater and one concerned with parochial politics. When you start targeting one elected official in this state legislative action that takes action from both Chambers, that's the time we should say, 'Wait a second, let's stop back and take a look at what direction we're headed in.' Because this may be Tom Hines today, and it clearly is, there is no dispute about that. It is Tom Hines. there is some political cover, I quess, because now they're impacting all the downstate assessors, your friends and mine who will not be permitted to attend our bake sales and all the things we do downstate over this stupid provision. But today it's Tom Hines. Tomorrow it could be your district or mine. And when did we start using both

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

legislative Chambers to go after one political person? charge of the Clinton Just because that person is in campaign or someone else's campaign. When you start putting the full weight of the legislative process to direct your personal attacks on one elected official, is the time you have crossed that line on good government. This is clearly a partisan attack on one official. something this Chamber should not even consider. It is below the dignity, or what dignity we have left in Chamber when it comes to partisan politics, and enough is enough. No, there's not much left. But Ladies Gentlemen, if you're using your political party and if we would use our political party to draw these attacks, remember this goes both ways and can very well go both And whether it's Tom Hines one day or one of you next year or someone else, you're setting a terrible, terrible precedent and that precedent could stand and the repercussions will be felt. This is not something we should be engaged in. It does not matter what party. Our party should never even consider attacking one individual on your side of the aisle, similarly, you should never consider attacking one who might be a Member of our When you establish this policy, you will establish it from now and forever. And if that's the heritage your chamber, your side of the aisle wants to leave with this Body and leave with the people of this State of Illinois, you're going to be the ones responsible for But leaving that heritage, that legacy of partisan politics to an unprecedented level in the history of the State of Illinois. That will be your legacy from this Chamber and your legacy for serving in this House. There are some of you and there are some of us who only have a

## 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

opportunity to serve in this Chamber for one term or two terms and sometimes we do Death Resolutions, we talk about ' the impact some individual might have had. I know when I leave this Chamber, I would like to look back and say I did something good for the people of Illinois. If you go back and you leave this Chamber and say, 'This is the legacy I have left, a legacy of partisanship, a legacy of personal attacks on elected officials.' That is the legacy you will leave to the people of the state and your family and that is how you will be remembered. Remember this is a Chamber that stays on. Look at the Gentleman above you. That will be the legacy of this Body. Now if that's your legacy, you will have the chance to do it in a few minutes, but I will certainly not be a part of it. I would not be a part of it if Democrats attempted to do it because it's not the right thing to do. It is clearly not the right thing to do. would ask you simply to vote on the merits, but that one hasn't worked in the last year and a half, so why ask now? But I would ask you just one last time, consider what you're doing. Consider the precedent you're setting here tonight and the precedent you're setting and the legacy you're leaving for your family because that's how you will be remembered in this Chamber, strictly partisan politics. And that is not in the best interest of the people of this state no matter what region you live in and no matter what political party."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kotlarz."

Kotlarz: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my 'present' vote, I have a
 potential conflict."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Also, I'd like to explain my

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

'present' vote as a conflict of interest, but I would also like to ask some questions of the Sponsor. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Fantin: "As township assessors do not deal directly with the books, why would this apply to them as far as the fund-raising personal appearance qo?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Well, Representative, downstate, throughout the state, township assessors in other counties do, do assessing and do deal with the books."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "In Cook County that is not the case. But with the township assessors, would this mean that all of the assessors, let's say in Cook County, their employees are also covered by this where they cannot attend functions or solicit any campaign funds?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "That's my understanding, yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "Would this mean also that the secretaries, clerks, computer operators, storeroom people, custodians, everyone employed by the assessor's office would be included?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, they could not...they could not solicit a contribution. They could make a contribution, but they cannot solicit while the books are open."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "So what you're telling me, that all these hundreds of people that may be only a storeroom clerk that work for an assessor's office, a secretary, a janitor, they cannot solicit funds for any political party while the books are

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

open?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "As I said earlier, they cannot solicit or on behalf of the assessor or others. They can make contributions and they can solicit when the books have been closed."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "So if I have a brother, sister, member of my family running for political office - Cook County, the books are open at all times, so I could never solicit funds, work for these people or lend my name. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "You could. During the time the books are open, you could not. At the time the books close you may do so, but you can, if you choose, make a political contribution to your brother, your sister or whomever you wish. So you can make a political contribution to those individuals."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "But if my spouse was running for office, I could not
 attend their political function, his political function or
 help fund-raise?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, you...the answer to your question would be that they cannot solicit directly or indirectly during the time that the books are open in that instance."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "I don't know even where to begin with my disgust on this Bill. I cannot believe you would even think of sponsoring something such as this and let me say to all my friends on the other side of the aisle, you have a lot of Cook County people over there. Most Cook County assessors are Republicans. That means not one of them can attend your functions. They cannot solicit funds for you, help you in

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

any way, not in any way at all because Cook County books are open all the time. So you had all better consider this, think about it and vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Santiago."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Santiago: "Representative Kubik, is this Amendment the same as your 1516, Amendment #4?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "No, it is not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Yes. Then, let me ask you this question. Does this

Amendment create...eliminates the Tax Board of Appeals?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Santiago, as you may recall in last year when the Legislature passed a Bill which created a Board of Review for Cook County, there was a provision which included an Interim Board of Review. As you may know, there was some court action on that issue. In order to alleviate some of the lack of definity on that issue, what we have done is to clean up the language in the law which provides that the Board of Review...I'm sorry, back up. The Cook County Board of Tax Appeals will be able to operate as it operates the current fashion, with two members, until the first Monday in December of 1988...1998. I'm sorry. And then it will have succession powers and will then move to a three member Board of Review. So it does nothing to abolish the Board of Tax Appeals. It simply provides the succession language and cleans up the law and takes out the Interim Board of Review language."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Yes, so, in actuality, what you're telling me is that

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

and what you just explained to me and which I know for a fact, was that part of the Bill that we passed last year was unconstitutional and you're trying right now to modify the portion that was found unconstitutional. Am I correct in making that assessment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, I think that as I indicated earlier, there was some court action on this issue. We have sought to alleviate any potential confusion and as a consequence we have eliminated the provisions with respect to the Interim Board and have provided for an orderly transition between the current Cook County Board of Tax Appeals to the new Board of Review. I might point out that even though an earlier Representative indicated that the Civic Federation is not in support of this Bill, they are in support of this language and feel that it's necessary."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Yes, Representative Kubik. So what we're doing is, if

I understand this correctly and if I recall from last year,
we eliminated the two commissioners and we're creating a
board of three commissioners. Am I correct? Is that what
this Amendment does?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Rubik: "Representative, I think that the Legislature, under House
Bill 1465 of last year, made the judgement that the Cook
County Board of Tax Appeals, which currently is a two
member board, should be expanded to be a three member board
and that policy decision was made. This particular Bill
does not change that. That three member board would be
elected and that would occur in 1998 and they would take
office in December, the first Monday in December of 1998."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Santiago."

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Santiago: "Is there a provision in this Amendment which creates three election districts in Cook County?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, this Bill does not contain any election districts. It does not contain a map in this legislation. There is no map in this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, in my analysis of the Bill it talks about how we are changing the section regarding the reduced assessment of homestead property and that we're extending that to all property. Could you explain to me a little bit how that would work and why we would need that provision?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "What that would do is if a taxpayer was able to go to a board of review or the State Property Tax Appeals Board and reach a fair assessment or a reduced assessment from where the assessor's level was. What this provision would say, and I might point out that this is already the law for residential property, is that that assessment would remain in effect until the next reassessment unless an assessor or board of review could show that there were factors which would indicate that the assessment should be increased. So what we've done is allowed the same provision for commercial property as presently is for residential property in the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, I have not heard any complaints from my area about...about this provision, about there being a problem with commercial property. So why would we do this? What is the justification for this new concept?"

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, it would...if a taxpayer goes through the process of appealing his or her assessment, in instances the assessor, even though they reduced assessment - in other words an assessment that is lower than where the assessor assessed the property at, that individual could face the following year the assessment going up again without any factors which indicate that that assessment should go up. What this does is simply says, that between the time you are assessed and then reassessed, if you can prove your case, you don't have to keep going back to the Board of Appeals, or, I'm sorry, the Board of Review every year to get a fair assessment. I might point out there are some very good balances built into this provision. So that if a person, receives a reduced assessment and the conditions change -I'll give you an example, a building that's empty and the assessment is reduced, suddenly becomes full, and that means there's a change in the condition and therefore the assessment should go up."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Representative, I haven't heard any great outcry from the business community that they need that provision in the law. So why do we have to include it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Rubik: "Well, Representative, being one who has sat through the Revenue Committee for a number of years, I can tell you that there have been a number of proposals of this nature that have been brought to the Revenue Committee and as I indicated, we did this for a residential property last year. It's good public policy. Nobody should have to keep going back to get a fair assessment simply because the

135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

assessor decides to increase the assessment on a regular basis without regard to the action by the Board of Review."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the Bill. I have a memo dated May 21st from the National Taxpayers United of Illinois and it talks about House Bill 375 and this Conference Committee and it says 'this Conference Committee Report is not acceptable as it stands, please oppose the current version', and it goes on and talks about working in some other provisions. So I would just simply point out to anyone in this Chamber, who believes it's important to look at the concerns that the National Taxpayers United of Illinois have, that they oppose this proposal, and I would urge all Members to join in that opposition in voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I Move the Previous Question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Representative Kubik now moves that the House have it. adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 375. All those will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who who wish? wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 'ayes', 45 'no', 6 voting 'present' and the 61 Gentleman, Representative Granberg, requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Read the Affirmative Roll, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives voting in the affirmative

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. are: Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Deuchler. Cross. Doody. Durkin. Goslin. Hassert. Tim Johnson. Tom Johnson. Klingler. Hoeft. Hughes. Kubik. Lachner. Lawfer. Krause. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Andrea Moore. Mulligan. Maureen Murphy. Myers. Noland. O'Connor. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. John Turner. Wait. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zickus and Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Granberg, question of the Affirmative Roll?"

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see. Is

Representative Klingler voting with her suburban leadership

again?"

Speaker Daniels: "Do you have a question of her?"

Granberg: "I'm sorry, I see her now. I see her. Representative
Ann Hughes?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hughes is here."

Granberg: "Oh."

Speaker Daniels: "Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe is here, as always.

Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Wennlund?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wennlund is at his chair as always. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Salvi, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi is in his chair. Further questions?"

135th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1996
- Granberg: "Thank you for the indulgence, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure. Representative Tenhouse?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tenhouse is here. Further questions?"
- Granberg: "No, Mr. Speaker. I believe that's all the questions we have."
- Speaker Daniels: "This question having received 61 'ayes', 45 'no', 6 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 375. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee announcements."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution #131, offered by Representative Meyer. House Joint Resolution #133, offered by Representative Meyer. These are referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill now moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, May 22, 1996 at the hour of 10 o'clock a.m. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and allowing perfunctory time for Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 22, 1996 at the hour of 10 o'clock a.m."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Perfunctory Session will be in order.

  Committee Report. Committee Report from Representative
  Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which
  the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action
  taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve
  for consideration' to the House Floor, House Joint
  Resolution #71. Committee notice. Rules Committee will

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 21, 1996

meet at 7:05 in the Speaker's Conference Room. Committee will meet at 7:05 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately. Perfunctory Session will be back in order. Committee Report. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21st, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' to the House Floor, Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #71. The Committee Report should, should read that reported 'do approve for consideration' the Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #71. Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned. The House will reconvene in full Session Wednesday, May 22nd at the hour of 10:00 a.m."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS
89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

97/05/07 09:18:30

# MAY 21, 1996

HB-0375	CONFERENCE	PAGE	78		
HB-1014	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18		
HB-1249	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43	-	6
SB-0454	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4		
SB-0542	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3		
SB-0825	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13		
SB-1122	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71		
SB-1414	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6		
SB-1459	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	67		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	11		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	12		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	65		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66		
HR-0128		PAGE	43		
HR-0130		PAGE	72		
HJR-0128		PAGE	43		
HJR-0129		PAGE	43		
HJR-0130		PAGE	43		
HJR-0131		PAGE	43		
HJR-0132		PAGE	43		
HJR-1289		PAGE	43		
SJR-0098		PAGE	73		
SJR-0103	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	14		

## SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - MAJOR REED	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE WINTERS	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE WOJCIK IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	2
GUESTS- 8TH GRADERS FROM GALENA HIGH SCHOOL	PAGE	7
REPRESENTATIVE TIM JOHNSON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	13
REPRESENTATIVE WOJCIK IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	14
GUESTS -MANDELA ELEMENTARY	PAGE	14
REPRESENTATIVE TIM JOHNSON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	15
GUESTS - SALEM CHRISTAIN SCHOOL	PAGE	17
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	18
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE - JIM HARRY	PAGE	18
REPRESENTATIVE TIM JOHNSON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	43
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE - JIM HARRY	PAGE	77
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	93
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	93
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	94
GUESTS - SPEECH CLASS PLEASANT PLAINS H.S.	PAGE	2
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #1	PAGE	11
GUESTS - CHURCH REPS. FROM THROUGHOUT CHICAGO	PAGE	43
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #2	PAGE	65
GUESTS - PSI FOSTER CARE STUDENTS	PAGE	64
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #3	PAGE	77