70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- Speaker Churchill: "The House will be in order. The Members will be in their chairs, Representative Churchill in the Chair.

  The Chaplain for the day is the Pastor Ernie Rex of Grace Lutheran Church in St. Charles. Pastor Rex is the guest of Representative Tom Johnson. Will the guests in the gallery please rise and join us for the invocation. Pastor Rex."
- Pastor Rex: "Gracious Lord, we give thanks to You for this day, for the warmth and Your presence with us. We give thanks to You for Your presence with those who are not here but who struggle throughout our state. We especially remember those in areas of flooding. We especially pray that You'll be with them this day. Be with those in this chamber, grant them Your wisdom and Your vision, grant them Your spirit that though their actions this day may truly meet the needs of all Your people. Amen."
- Speaker Churchill: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance this morning by Representative Currie."
- Currie 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 Churchill: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle? Representative Currie. Representative Currie would you use the mic at the desk next to yours, apparently there's a snag in your mic this morning."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that

  Representative Martinez is excused today, and is there a

  particular reason why you turned just my microphone off?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Currie, the Journal will reflect the absence of Representative Martinez and, no, it's not just yours. Perhaps...Representative Currie,

## 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- since this is most likely our last morning to be together here, how is Representative Martinez, is he coming along well or not?"
- Currie: "Thank you, for the inquiry. Representative Martinez, is doing very well indeed. His assistant, Linda who has been with us this week saw him just before she came to Springfield to work on things for him in his office here in Springfield, says he's just doing wonderful well, looks good, is getting around well, is definitely on the mend."
- Speaker Churchill: "Please, wish him well. Representative Spangler, any absences on the Republican side?"
- Spangler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I'm please to announce that all the Republicans are here."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Journal will so reflect. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 117 Members answering the roll, and a quorum is present. The House will come to order. For what reason does the Gentleman form Cook, Representative Blagojevich rise?"
- Blagojevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night on the last vote, House Joint Resolution 47, I accidently hit the 'no' button. I intended to vote 'yes'. I would like the record to reflect and on House Joint Resolution 47, I would like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Churchill: "Let the record reflect that. Mr. Clerk, what
   is the status of Senate Bill 925?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 925, a Motion to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 has been filed."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder now moves that the House refuse to recede with Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 925. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Motion caries. The House refused to recede from Amendment #1 to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Senate Bill 925 and the House request a Conference Committee be appointed. Representative Currie, do you have...is your mic working now or did you get..."

Currie: "Testing, testing. It seems to be."

Speaker Churchill: "Sounds good."

- Currie: "Speaker, I rise on a point of parliamentary procedure. Representative Lang, last night made reference to the possibility that there would be few...few copies of the budget available on the Members desks at the point at which we come to a vote on that topic and I rise merely to point out that the Constitution of the State of Illinois say in...in the legislative Article, Section 8.D, that a Bill and each Amendment thereto, shall be reproduced and placed on the desk of each Member before final passage. So, I merely rise to point that out to the Chair in case there was any...any idea of passing the budget, for example without making sure that each and every Member has a copy of that Amendment on his or her desk."
- Speaker Churchill: "Thank you very much, for sharing that with us. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Blagojevich rise?"
- Blagojevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just correct the record, yet again. I intend to vote 'yes' on House Resolution 47. Inadvertently, I hit the 'no' button last night. I would like the record to reflect that I intend to vote 'yes' and I want to vote...have a recorded vote of 'yes' House Resolution 47. Thank you."
- Speaker Churchill: "I'm sure that you probably pushed the right button but it seems that the electronics in that roll have been blown by Representative Currie. For what reason does the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig rise?"
- Hannig: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Do we get a chance to ask questions

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- of the Sponsor on Senate Bill 925, on the Motion to nonconcur or refuse to recede?"
- Speaker Churchill: "There's nobody seeking recognition at the time we moved that and its already gone. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 2429."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2429, a Motion to concur with Senate

  Amendment #1, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Pankau."
- Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, everybody. The last day. Yes. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2429. The underlying Bill dealt with the Response Action Contractor Indemnification Act. Basically this is a fund that for all state contracts, pays 5% of the environmental portion of the contract into this fund and at a certain point we're asking in this legislation that longer the payments be made into this fund and that...it be allowed to set there until such time that it reaches a level of \$4 million. The Senate Sponsor of this Bill, Senator Rauschenberger, participated in a bipartisan blue ribbon panel on purchasing. I believe it's met for about two years. Basically the recommendations of that have been put into a report, have been placed on the shelf, however there were a couple of the items that dealt with basically just the contractors portion of the biddings that Senator Rauschenberger...Senator Rauschenberger felt very strongly about. And so, included in this Amendment are seven provisions...they all deal with construction industry. the construction industry council is in favor of this, the Capital Development Board has no problems with it, CMS has no problems and so, I ask for your approval of this so that Senator Rauschenberger can get his seven points into this

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Wojcik in the Chair. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig is recognized."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, I also served on the blue ribbon panel and that was a very comprehensive piece of legislation that was introduced in the House and the Senate and actually, it passed this chamber last year, and I think everyone in this chamber voted for it. My first question is, why are we being given just a scaled downed version of that? Why can't we see the whole proposal before us today, the whole blue ribbon proposal?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "From what Senator Rauschenberger has told me, these were the only points that there was total agreement on. Other parts of the...other parts of the report and the task force suggestions, there were disagreements on with with various parties and so that at least a portion of it, at least something of it gets done. He included it as an Amendment in this particular Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, I think I stated earlier we had passed the whole blue ribbon proposal in this chamber, the Senate had passed a similar but somewhat different version in their chamber but we did all, in both chambers addressed more than just this part of the Act. It would seem to me that it would not take that much effort on the part of the Senator to put together a proposal to finally...finally address all parts of the Purchasing Act that we have here...need to be addressed here in Springfield and wouldn't you agree that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

maybe we'd be better served today to send this Bill back to

Conference and bring the whole blue ribbon proposal back?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Although, I do not wish to speak for the Senator, I'm sure that he's very concerned about the entire purchasing thing and, in fact, I think that's one thing that he's made sort of his particular area of interest, if you might say. But, in his...for whatever reason he chose just to take this portion and to attach it to my Bill 2429. So, other...what other things he might be planning on doing, what other agreements can be made, I'm not privy to those, Representative."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "As I understand, Representative that, that was what the Senator had in mind but I think this is really an opportunity for us in the House to send a message back to the Senate that we would like to see before we leave today a blue ribbon or at lease some major sufficient proposal on purchasing go to the Governor and we could do that very simply if we would nonconcur in the Amendment and put this Bill in Conference and I'm asking, why won't you do that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "With all due respect, Representative Hannig, I think that the clock is ticking and I'd like to at least do this."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I appreciate your position on that, so let just address the Bill and ask some questions on it. In the Amendment, Representative...in the Amendment on page 8 on line 3, I believe, it begins on...towards the end of that line. It says, the contract may be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. Okay, then...had a little

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

surprise over here on this side of the aisle. Then also, the other part of the question is...okay, then on page 9...or on line 9 of that same page, on page 8, it says...it said at the end of that line bids and then on page 10, are awarded to lowest responsible bidder. So, I guess my question is on page...or on line 3, it says contracts may be awarded but then on line 9, it says they are awarded and I'm not sure if there isn't an inconsistency in that. Could you explain to us how this is suppose to work?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "I congratulate you, Representative Hannig, because were able to spot the exact heart of this Amendment. This does change the language to the lowest responsible bidder from the language that we have now. And, my understanding is, that there are many court cases right now in which the language that was used in this particular Amendment and I believe Senator Rauschenberger, worked on this guite a bit. Basically scoots right through the middle of whatever comes down on either side of the court cases. Allows for the lowest responsible bidder but it doesn't give an edge either way to one...one party or the other. So, that no matter what the court cases eventually come down deciding, this language will be in place and this will be able to be interpretated properly and implemented."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, bring your questions to a close.

Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Madam Speaker, this is a rewrite of a major piece of legislation, I'd like to...that I participated in with other members of the blue ribbon panel and there's very many questions here that I would like to ask the Sponsor, with your indulgents, please. I guess I'm still not clear, Representative Pankau as to why it says that the contracts

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

may be awarded on one line and then it says, bids are awarded on the other and the question is, may they be awarded or are they to be awarded? It's sort of like the question of saying, 'may' or 'shall'."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "I think you have to read the two paragraphs in their entirety. One deals with the competitive bidding process and the other one deals with the definition itself. My understanding from the legal types that are around is that this is the proper language so that whatever happens in court, the procedures will apply."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman, is recognized."

Hoffman: "Yes, I would yield my time to Representative Hannig."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Continuing on those lines, I guess...Representative, what does it mean, the lowest responsible bidder? What does that mean in your mind?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Well, I don't know if you want to know what's in my mind right now. But, those words, lowest responsible bidder are word that have now become terms of our legal frame work. And, my understanding and please correct me if I'm wrong, because you obviously know more about this than I do. Is that those will now apply to whatever legal cases come down."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "And one of the difficulties we've had with the whole Purchasing Act is that on the last day of a previous Session, we voted on a Budget Implementation Act that basically repealed the whole Purchasing Act as we knew it. And now we have tried to come and put together piece by

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

piece, I guess, it looks like with this effort today, a new Purchasing Act since we've obviously given up on an effort to address the entirety, the entirety of that problem in a new Act that would address all the parts but, one of the problems that we had was that...that Budget implementation Act talked about the lowest responsible bidder and on it's face sounds like a good concept. But I think in practice it has become to mean basically about anything that the respective agency wants it to mean. Is it your opinion and your legislative intent that that means that we have to accept the lowest bid?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "My understanding that it's the lowest responsible bid, which means there are other factors other than the sheer dollars that can be brought into the determination. That doesn't mean that the lowest dollar bidder won't be accepted. Just means that you can look at other factors also."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "And therein, I think Representative lies much the problem that we've had with the Purchasing Act. You're basically saying that in spite of the fact that my firm may submit the lowest bid that the agencies are still free under this proposal as they are under the current law to accept any other bid that's on the table. Isn't that right?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "I believe, Representative that the opposite was also true, that just because it was the lowest dollar amount did not necessarily mean that you got the best quality for the dollars that you were expending. And, I believe what CMS is trying to do is get the best quality for the dollars

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

that you are expending. Sometimes there are other factors involved and you know that yourself."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I think that what you say is true in some respects, Representative but particularly today as we debate a scaled down version of the Purchasing Act, that's just applicable to construction projects, for the most part these are projects that are drawn up on a piece of paper, the bidders are given the specifications and said, bid it. And, it would seem to me that in those cases we're everybody is bidding to the same specifications that those were the cases where we would most likely want to take the lowest bidder. Would that not be the case?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Representative, I can't speak about state contracts but in my previous experience on the DuPage County Board, built two major buildings during that time and even though we built a beautiful county building and the specifications were yea thick and hugh and everybody thought you had dotted every 'i' and crossed every 't', we still had bricks that fell off. We built a new court house building and although the documents were even thicker, cause we thought we had learned and there was detail, upon detail, upon detail. We still had air quality problems that came and we had to evacuate the building and redo some stuff. don't know Representative Hannig, how you are every going to prevent something from slipping through the cracks on any kind of contract anywhere. And, I think what you're doing here is just saying, based on many factors such as passed experience, such problems you might have had and many other things. You've got to take the lowest responsible bid. Do, I think it's going to wipe out all

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

our problems, absolutely not. But it's a start."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

- Hannig: "Well, I appreciate your statements and I guess in that respect maybe we disagree and so I'll just move on and ask some additional questions. Part of the language said that the bids are publicly solicited..."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, I've given you ten minutes. I'm going to give you one more minute."
- Hannig: "Okay. The bids are publicly solicited and open, so they're open publicly. Will these bids then be available to anyone to examine so the losing bidders can see the winning bids. Will that be available, Representative?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "My understanding is, there's no change from what is currently in practice and I specifically don't know what the current practice is but if the current practice is that they are then available for public scrutiny, that's what it would be afterwards."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, I'm not certain how it's totally handed in this part of the law either, to be quite honest with you, Representative. But, I know that part of the problem that we have with the Purchasing Act is that often times the...in some parts of the law the opening bid is announced at a public meeting, opened and announced at a public meeting but then the losers have no opportunity to examine that bid to see how or why, it may be that this individual firm came to a lower bid than theirs and it just seems to me that while...since this is all public moneys that we're awarding these contracts with that anybody ought to have an opportunity to see the bid and see the specifications that were submitted with the bid and it just seems to me that

70th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1995
- that makes good sense. Is it your intend...your intention that that would be the law with this Bill?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "One more answer to the question, Representative, then I'm going to recognize someone else. Representative Pankau."
- Pankau: "As I said, Representative Hannig. That part is not being changed at all, so whatever the current practice is right now will continue to be. But it seems to come to mind that we also have the open freedom of information law in effect also. So, I would say, if you can't get the information by one avenue I'm sure the other avenue is available to you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang is recognized."
- Lang: "I'd like to yield to Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Louie, Representative Lang, there evidently was a nice article about you in the <u>Tribune</u> this morning.

  Congratulations. Nice tie. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I was yielding to Representative Hannig. Thank you for the compliment."
- Speaker Wojcik: "You're welcome. Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative Pankau, there's at least some concern on this side of the aisle that this Amendment could impact minority owned firms. Could you clarify to us, how and if that would be the case or at least to the best of your knowledge, how this would impact the minority and the other preferences we have for women and veteran's in the Purchasing Act?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."
- Pankau: "As I said before, Representative Hannig, this legislation was written to scoot right through the middle of certain grey areas. That also is one of the grey areas,

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

dealing with minority and female business and. my understanding is that that also is being tested in the court at this time. It certainly is not the intent either enhance that particular area nor to take away from that particular area. It leaves it exactly as it is right now and. if you can enlighten us as to exactly where it does sit right now we'd probably all value information."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, under the current law there are some preferences that are available for minorities and for women and for different veteran's that have come to me on the top of my head. Senator Rauschenberger, in one of the proposals that he sent over last year actually attempted to sunset those provision. And that was one of the reasons that this House did not accept his proposal last year and my concern is, that while it doesn't, so bodily state the sunset in this proposal that perhaps and, in fact, some of the language that I read I am concerned that maybe he's trying to do that in a more indirect way. And maybe you...either you could answer as to whether or not it would change any of that."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "That indeed is not in here at all. It leaves that part completely silent and just basically proceeds with the other issues here."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, in the question of advertisements, what is this proposal require as far as advertisements, public advertisements and how does that differ from the current law."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Pankau: "The current law provides that the advertisements may be made three times the first and last advertised at least ten days apart. This Amendment provides that purchases contracts and other obligations will be advertised in the official newspaper of the state at least once, no more than 14 days before the bid opening. I'm sorry, no less than 14 days, it's my eyes."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, it's early, Representative. I think we're all having a little trouble engaging our eyes and our brains in some cases. Let me ask then, why are we making the change from current law, much of this you said earlier was very much along the lines of current law but in the advertisement area it seems like we're going to give less notice. Could you perhaps address that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Actually, Representative, we're increasing it, we're requiring it rather than making it permissive."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Often times I'm asked in my district, where these advertisement are, in other words in rural Illinois south of Springfield, we don't seems to see these advertisements in a newspaper. Is there an official state newspaper where we should look and tell my people to look."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Yes, Representative."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Could you tell me what it is and why it is that that was chosen?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "No, I don't know."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Hannig: "Did you happen to know the name of it for the Members of the Body that may be interested?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Representative Hannig, my staff doesn't know. It changes every year it's bid but they don't know what it is either. So...and I've never seen it, I know think it's the Capital Fax though."

Speaker Woicik: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "It's not the Mt. Olive Herold either. Representative. maybe we can find out from some of your associates over there at a later time. We had some language in one of the Bills that we passed last year that had to do with some of the ethic questions that we sometimes have to deal with in this chamber. And we dealt with prohibitions on these revolving door policies where people go from working with agency to working with private enterprise and then coming in and lobbying in effect the same people that had worked for in the not too distant pass, things of that kind. The anti collusion policies were included. disclosures were included. I don't see where any of that kind language is in this proposal. Could you clarify as to where or not it is in the proposal and if not, why not?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Pankau."

- Pankau: "Representative Hannig, it is not in this Amendment to this Bill and why those other things that you mention where not included, I don't know."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hannig, bring your questions to a close."
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative, and let thank Madam Speaker for giving me the opportunity to ask these questions and let me thank Representative Pankau for doing her very best to try to answer them. And, I would say that this is a step

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

forward in the purchasing area but I would also say that we found ourself in a difficult situation, number one, because we passed a Budget Implementation Act a number of years ago that we weren't certain what it did. Number two. then we followed up by trying to address that problem by appointing bipartisan blue ribbon commission, they came in with recommendations and we never were able to get that passed both chambers in the last two years and so now we have an attempt by the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor to least implement a part of that blue ribbon proposal to at least address a part of the problem that we created a few year ago with a Budget Implementation Act that we passed and I certainly commend the Sponsor and urge a 'yes' vote on...for Members on both side of the aisle to this limited but at least positive step in the direction of reforming the Purchasing Act here in Illinois. And. I thank the Sponsor for her answers."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg, is recognized."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill, to refresh the memories of the Members here. In the Governor's 19...January 1994, stated the the State Address, he called. 'for serious reform in our procurement laws', he later said that he'd offer his own version, that version subsequently died in the Senate Rules Committee. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the previous speaker indicated, while this is a promising first step, we still have quiet a ways to go. This by no means is comprehensive or is all inclusive as the recommendations made by the Auditor General's Blue Ribbon Task Force, which Representative Hannig, myself, former Representative Parcells, and other Members of this

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

chambers...Representative Kaszak and other Members of this chambers served on. And perhaps one glaring weakness pertains to the absences in this measure of any reference whatsoever, to completive bidding on leases. The State of Illinois bids \$93 million annual...the State of Illinois procurement \$93 million annually in state leases. estate leasing requirements in this state are amongst most subjective in the nation, and there is certainly room for dramatic improvement in this area. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the other glaring absences in this measure is concrete language on how this Amendment pertains to minority firms. Minority and women owned firms, since it calls for the terms and conditions of solicitation and bidding process to apply equally to all bidders. Now, I understand how the issue here in Illinois and nationally on affirmative action has been subject to question and it's subject to review. But there has never been any discussion along these lines on these matter and...and more importantly this legislation fails address that serious policy question even in an indirect I submit to you that the reforms which were suggested here today, while they are a good first step they do not touch upon many of the areas which have been the subject of discussion for many months and years among both sides of the aisle and from reform groups such as common cause. So, while I do rise in support of measure, I have to say that it's qualified support because ultimately if we do not address the issue of competitive bidding on leases, we really can't go so far as to say, that we've solved the problem. The issue of real estate, lease verses purchases is one where we all have to take a serious, thoughtful and analytical look. The Department of

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Public Aid, for example is intending to build a \$18.8 million building in the City of Chicago. The procedures processives which are used to make those determinations. after public statements, after public statements made earlier that such a building was not going be built. I think merits serious examination, as do many of the state leases which are currently expiring and subject for renewal. Such as the lease at the Department of Public Aid building in what the former Harris Building here in the State of...in City of Springfield. Leases, the reason why we need to address leases in this Bill is because quiet often leases are being bid for...leases are being awarding for state offices at rates which are hardly competitive bid. In fact, at rates for Springfield comparable to those of downtown Chicago. This is an area which if we go home without addressing, we will have been remiss in our duties. Thank you."

- Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none,
  Representative Pankau to close."
- Pankau: "I ask for your concurrence on this Amendment, Amendment

  1, to House Bill 2429 and for Representative Hannig, the
  Edwardsville 'Intelligentsia' is the official newspaper of
  the state for contracts. Thank you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2429?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. 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 117 'ayes', no 'no' nays, none voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2429, and this Bill, having received the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, call Senate Bill 587."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 587, a Motion to recede from House

Amendment #1, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would move to recede from House Amendment #1, on Senate Bill 587."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang is recognized."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Wojcik: "State your inquiry."

Lang: "Thank you. I assume we're going to have these Motions to recede explained, what we're receding from, why we're receding from them and what the Sponsor intends to do with the Bill after we recede. Would I be correct in that assumption, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Wojcik: "I believe so, Representative. Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, I'm moving to recede really because of the time constraints and the underlying Bill is very important to the Comptroller. The underlying Bill just allows the Comptroller to accept electronically submitted vouchers and requires the state agencies to maintain signatures documents and to maintain revocations of the delegation of vouchers signature authority. That Bill will allow the Comptroller's Office to modernize the Amendment created, if you recall the Comptrollers Merit Advisory Board and imposed a fee. That is the Amendment, from which I'm moving to recede."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lang: "Thank you, Can you explain why this Amendment was on the Bill in the first place?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "It was originally another Bill, I believe and was added as an Amendment."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, who put it on the Bill and why did they put it on the Bill?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "It is another initiative of the Comptroller's Office to eliminate the Comptroller's Merit Advisory Board and to establish the administrative fund for the Comptroller. But, because of the time constraints and because of the need to modernize the Comptroller's Office, the Comptroller is afraid that, with the Amendment the Bill will get caught up in a Conference Committee and maybe the underlying Bill will not get out, and elect to allow the Comptroller's Office to submit and obtain an electronic vouchers is just to streamline state government and save us money."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, let me see if I get this straight. The Illinois
House of Representatives controlled be the Republican
Party. The Illinois Senate is controlled by...I think it
is the Republican Party. The Governor of this state and
the Comptroller of this state are...Republicans. Why would
you...why will the Comptroller have trouble getting this
Bill out of a Conference Committee?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "There was also a provision in the Amendment,

Representative that provided an exemption to changes in the
lapse period which was included in House Bill 2251, for
textbook purposes...purchases, I'm sorry and that Bill has

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

not moved and that is also part of the Amendment and part of the reason we are moving to recede from the Amendment."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I appreciate that comment but you've indicated,
Representative that you were concerned that this Bill might
get caught up in the Conference Committee process. Surely,
Mr. Philip and Mr. Daniels, would be interested in helping
the Comptroller. How will this Bill get caught up in the
Conference Committee process?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "as you know, Representative, this is the happy day that
we are suppose to adjourn so there is only one day and so,
because the underlying Bill is so important to the
Comptroller we are moving to recede."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, would you have us believe that if this Bill had been called a week ago you would still be receding from the House Amendments or would that not have been enough time either?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "I can't speak for what the Senate does and what would happen after that."

Speaker Lindner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Except, I asked what you would do. If this was a week ago, would you be receding because there was not enough time?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "No, probably not."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, if we recede, what will...this Bill will go straight to the Governor, to it is really important that we understand what everything that it does. So, can you tell

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

us what the Bill will do when we recede."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

- Lindner: "Yes, Representative. The underlying Bill authorize the Comptroller to except electronically submitted vouchers. Requires state agencies to maintain signature documents and records of delegations of vouchers signature authority and requires state agencies to maintain revocations of the delegation of vouchers signature authority. It will allow the Comptroller to enter into the electronic age, streamline state government and save money, which I know is a main interest of yours."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang, bring your questions to a close."
- Lang: "Well, I'd be happy to do that, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the Sponsors answers and I'm truly sorry that in the process of running this House, a Republican Sponsor has run out of time to call her Bill the way she wants to call it when there is a Republican Speaker, running this place. I think that's a shame."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke, is recognized."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."
- Hartke: "Representative, I really think your piece of legislation is a real good idea and I see no need to receded from that at all. You introduced it because you thought it was a good concept, maybe I missed the point but why...why did the Senate not want this?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Well, thank you, Representative. I'm glad that you do think that the legislation is good but, I believe it is up

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

to the Sponsor of the Bill and also the Comptroller's Office to decide whether or not they want to proceed or recede from the Amendment."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "The Senate Sponsor is Deangelis."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "I really don't know what conversation Senator Deangelis had with other Members of the Senate."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I guess you're just taking their word for it then. Well, they don't want it so we take it off. Did he really work the Bill. Did he try his best, could have dialog took place in the Senate."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Senator Deangelis, always works every Bill that he does. He's a very good Senator, but since I've been so busy over here, I've not had a lot of time to go over and sit in the gallery and watch what the Senate is doing. So, I don't know how hard he's worked the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well now, Representative, when I get a Bill over in the Senate and I'm not happy with the Senate Sponsor, there's a possibility of you walking over there and asking that another Senator take...take over that piece of legislation.

Do you by chance, do that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lindner: "I never said, I was unhappy with the Senate Sponsor.

I'm very happy with the Senate Sponsor. And, no, I did not ask someone else to take the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, apparently he's picked up your Bill and just done nothing with it. You worked hard to get that over there.

And now, he just sat on it. He didn't speak on it, he wants it off. I think I would have found another Senator Sponsor to pickup that Bill and...pickup that Bill and continue to work it."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Well, number one, I'm loyal to my Republican Senators and this is a Senate Bill. This is not my Bill in the House. I am taking his Senate Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "So, you're trying to scuttle his Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "RepresentativeLindner."

Lindner: "No, we are passing the underlying Bill, Representative.

It is only the Amendment that we...the House Amendment from which I'm asking to recede."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I really think you ought stick to your guns and do what you think is right, not what the Senate thinks over there. Has intestinal fortitude. Go for it. Come on, I think you ought to refuse to recede and demand a Conference Committee so that we can...we can continue to work on this. We've got some time left. Who knows, we may be here a week yet. Then you'll have all kinds of time. Would you be for that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, speak for yourself that we may be here for a week. Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "I guess the question is, would I be for being here

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

another week. No, I would not. This is the happy day that we are going to adjourned, Representative."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, that might be but you know, no one on this side of the aisle and I believe on that side has not seen the budget. We've not seen the budget at all. Now, I'm a real slow reader because I've got to read line by line to try to understand exactly what it means. Representative Lindner, are you a speed reader?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "No, I always wanted to take it...a speed reading course but I have not."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, listen, I really hope that when and if we ever really get a budget on our desk and I'm confident that when we do, if we do today, it will probably be 8 or 900 pages. And I like to sit down and, you know, give me a little beverage and sit down in a nice easy chair and try to digest just what things are doing. And I would hope that we would be here a full week because 800 pages is a long time to try and digest things. I don't know whether this is..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, you're still on."

Hartke: "I don't know if this is a good idea or not. I'll sit and listen to more debate, I guess whether I'm going to support your move to recede from House Amendment."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Lindner to close."

Lindner: "Yes, I have nothing more to say except, please support the move to recede from the House Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 587?' All those in

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting voting 'nay'. 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 117 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The House does recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 587 and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2108."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2108, a Motion to concur with Senate
  Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 has been filed and approved for
  consideration."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik. Excuse me, Representative Kubik, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you. You don't understand my hand signals, Madam Speaker?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "I thought you were playing football and you made the goal."
- Lang: "No but touchdown. We would like to divide the question.

  Separate debate and separate votes on each Motion."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 is the blue ribbon task force legislation on horse racing. As many of you may know, Governor Edgar formed a task force on horse racing in Illinois in February of 1995. The task force contain 21 representatives of the horse racing industry, the State Legislature and the State Government. Who formulated a series of proposals on how to improve the condition of horse racing in Illinois. This task force met over a period of months and discussed and debated many

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

issues. They...their basic goal was to try to address the many issues confronting the horse racing industry and address those issues in a comprehensive manner. The provisions on the report that they ultimately came up with are contained in House Bill 2108. As I understand it, for the benefit of Representative Lang, my understanding is that Senate Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment and really doesn't deal with the full issue. So I don't quite know how Mr. Lang wishes to proceed. We, can I suppose, concur on Senate Amendment #1, which is technical. Senate Amendment #2 is actually the major provisions of the Bill. So, Madam Speaker, since this Amendment is a technical Amendment perhaps we can concur with this Amendment and move to Amendment #2."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Amendment #1, is this simply a technical Amendment?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, my understanding is that Amendment #1 is...is primarily technical. Amendment #2 really is the Bill, so to speak. So everything in Amendment #2 becomes the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, so if you were me, if you were going to rant and rave or discuss this Bill, you would do that on Amendment 2

I quess?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "If I was in a ranting and raving mood I'd be happy to do that on Amendment #2. But..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lang: "Well, all right. We...I'll rest up. Amendment #2 will be here soon, I guess. That's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I would move to concur on Amendment #1."

Speaker Wojcik: "I'd didn't see your light, Representative. The Representative from Williamson, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Kubik, let me just ask you about Amendment #1 for just a second. Is there anything in the law today about the involvement of the state police in the oversight of the horse racing industry?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Woolard, as I understand Amendment #1.

Amendment #1, as you know, the state police do provide investigative services at horse racing facilities. My understanding of Amendment #1 is that it tightens up the law to provide that the horse racing facilities will provide reimbursement on an individual basis for the investigative services of the state police. So it codifies that part of the law."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "I agree but maybe it even goes a step further in my opinion. I think that it not only codifies the law but the guarantee that there will be involvement with the state police and any investigation that would become necessary without the invitation of the track owners themselves. But I do support and would like to agree with you in concurring in Amendment #1."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold is recognized."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Brunsvold: "Representative Kubik, is there anything in there for the Quad City Downs?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Not on this Amendment, Representative. This is a...this Amendment doesn't deal with the major provisions of the Bill. Not in this particular Amendment. This deals with an issue with respect to the state police and making sure that those services are provided and that they are done on an individual track basis."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Which Amendment has...is there something in there in some of the other Amendments or would you rather wait until we got that Amendment?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I think your question would probably be better directed at Amendment #2."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Representative Kubik, yesterday I tried...the other day I tried to pass a riverboat Bill that very strongly concerns my district, 500 plus jobs, millions of dollars of tax money to the City of Rock Island, tens of millions of dollars of tax money to the State of Illinois. Speaker Daniels didn't really care to help me and the people of my district. I know you're a very caring individual. Would you put this Bill into Conference Committee so we can get my riverboat stuff on it?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, I have been here for...could we ask the staff to move them. I've been here for 11 years and in that 11 years I've seen a lot of horse racing Bills. I've seen very few horse racing Bills that have ever passed because of a lack of consensus in the industry. We now

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

have a Bill where, although not every single individual in the industry has agreed with it, to general consensus is to agree. I am uncomfortable with the idea. And as I told you earlier I support your proposal. As a matter of fact it was put on my Bill but things take strange movement through this process. I would be reluctant to go to conference. Because I think for the first time in a long time we've got an opportunity to do something, for not only the industry but the horesmen. And I'd like to take advantage of that opportunity."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Representative Kubik and I know you're a caring individual and I thought maybe we could get the Governor's attention if we put this in Conference Committee. Maybe a two by four aside the head would get his attention and maybe we could do something for the people of Rock Island. But Jack I want to tell you I appreciate your efforts and I know you are caring individual that would help me if you had the opportunity. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2108?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. 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 103 'ayes', 12 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2108. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is the whole of the Bill, it is the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

important provisions in the Bill. Senate Amendment #2 House Bill 2108 would amend the Horse Racing Act. really are the...contain most of the provisions of the Governor's task force on horse racing. Representative Art Turner and I were appointed to that task force. It was, as Representative Turner knows, a collection of individuals throughout the industry who met and ...their charge was to bring forth recommendations that would assist the industry and assist the revenue generation of the industry and they came up with a number of proposals. And I will briefly through some of these proposals at this point in time. major components of this Bill include providing for the creation of full card simulcasting. Which for those of you who may not be familiar with the concept is when races from out of state or throughout the world are broadcast into the track and people are allowed to bet on those races. Provisions are made to split the revenues from those simulcast 50/50 between horsemen's purses and the race The Bill would provide for revenues at intertrack track. and on-track betting locations to be split between purses and track management. The Bill also provides for state and local tax revenues to remain at calendar year '94 levels for the first \$11 million. And then for the next million beyond the '94 level. these dollars would be allocated back to purses and for larger purses for horsemen and hopefully to stimulate the horse racing industry. Anything above that \$11 million would then go back to state local tax revenues. So this is a \$11 million priming the pump for purses. It provides for a...it provides for a race track improvement fund, a provision which would not only assist the construction of and the maintenance of tracks but the maintenance of those facilities that are

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the back stretch, which is where horsemen and their families live. So I think this is an excellent provision to help horsemen and their families as well. This also would provide for additional dollars and pari-mutuel waging at county fairs throughout the state. It would provide for some changes in thoroughbred breeder programs, including additional dollars for those horses that are conceived and fold in Illinois. It will also improve some...make some changes in the standard bred breeding program to again reward those who are breeders and horsemen in Illinois. It would provide for additional OTB facilities. It would allow for two additional off-track waging facilities license. including Quad City Downs. So Quad City Downs. although they are not doing racing, would be allowed to have additional facilities. In addition, Quad City Downs would be allowed to be issued an intertrack wagering OTB license for the facility itself. This Bill would provide for more flexibility and purse supplements to Illinois conceived and fold horses. It would...there were some concerns in the original report, which will be addressed later, regarding the betting over telephone that provision for many Members who I know expressed some concerns about it, has been removed and will be removed and I... a subsequent Amendment. But essentially this comprehensive approach to trying to increase revenue racing industry. It is estimated that these reforms and these changes will result in an additional \$38 million being put into purse money in Illinois. remind the Members that this is a billion dollar industry Illinois and that there are over 37,000 people who through directly or indirectly benefit from the horse racing industry and have some part in the horse racing

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

industry. So, this is an extremely important industry in our state. Those are briefly some of the proposals. I'd be happy to respond to your questions. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote in the concurrence Motion on Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Woolard: "Are the provisions in Senate Amendment 2, that are dealt with in subsequent Amendments as well, maybe in repeal or change or has there been an ongoing process in all of the build up of Amendments on this Bill that has maybe put something in one and taken it out in another.

Maybe even put it back and taking it out a third or fourth time along the process. Is there some of that, that takes place here?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, Representative Woolard, the...as you know this was a negotiation process and yes that is the case."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Madam Speaker. I know that it was our side of the aisle that asked to divide the Amendments here and I understand the process. But I think that we're really going to confuse everyone on this particular piece of legislation. And I would...I would request that the Sponsor of this at least make recommendation that we put Senate Amendments 2 through the following Senate Amendment 8 back together so that we don't confuse the issue. If you'll give us your word, Madam Speaker, that you'll give us a full discussion on the total comprehensive compilation of these Amendments."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, the...Representative Woolard had requested from the Chair. His request would be to place all of these Amendments on one vote. Simply because some things were added and deleted in the Bill. And his request was that we place these Amendments on one vote and that he be allowed full discussion on all of the Amendments. Because I think it is...I think Representative Woolard makes a good point. That this is a Bill that in total, I think it's better, I think it's best considered in total than individually. I would support his Motion or his concern."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Okay. Madam Speaker, what I requested while ago was that you would assure us that you would give us a full debate on the entire compilation of Amendments. We would like to put them back together."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, if it's in agreement, we will have full debate."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you. I would defer to the Sponsor."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Just to note, Madam Speaker, that we have already concurred in Senate Amendment #1. So what we're considering is Amendment 2, 5, 6 and 8."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, that's so noted. Representative Woolard, do you have any further questions?"

Woolard: "Madam Speaker, I think the process should work in such
a way that now we should defer back to the Sponsor of the
combined Amendments. Let him proceed with giving his
presentation and then we'll ask questions. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Kubik: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I think I pretty much fully explained the Bill. But what I want the Membership to know was, in particular, I know one of the more controversial, if you might call it, concerns that have been expressed about this Bill, have been the issue of telephone wagering. In the full context of this Bill. telephone wagering has been removed. So that those of you who have had concerns about that particular provision. This Amendment includes all of the proposals offered by the horse racing industry but takes that provision out. is a negotiated settlement by the people within the industry. It is supported by the breeders, it is supported by the horsemen and it is supported by the...those who own the tracks. I think it is a good agreement. And as I indicated earlier, I'd be happy to respond to any questions."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steve Davis."

Davis, S.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman vield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicated he will."

Davis, S.: "Representative Kubik, does this Bill, does it cover both thoroughbred racing and harness racing?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, it does. Yes, it does."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Davis."

Davis, S.: "And what are the provisions in here that...that the horsemen were particularly interested in, is it a change of formula at the tracks as far as how much money they're getting?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Davis, I'd be happy to respond to that.

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

What I would suggest is probably would be helpful is, Representative Woolard had a particular concern. I think perhaps maybe the concern that you have about those in the harness industry, standard bred industry they have expressed some concerns about, about some of the provisions in this Bill and I know some of the Members have heard from those people. Representative Woolard has been extremely active in that issue. And if it...with your indulgence I would defer to Representative Woolard and I think he has some important information that he could share with the Membership."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know that there's a lot of areas of concern by a lot of people in this Body and I think that there probably has been more concern by the division of moneys that would be going to thoroughbred as compared to standard breds and they split. I know that there has been active involved people in the lobbying area here for the last few weeks or few days that have been expressing their concerns for what they are afraid will be less than they had expected or hoped would be in this Bill. We've addressed this issue, we've addressed it effectively. I think that if in fact there is not a...at least acceptable gain for the standard bred horsemen of this state, that the Governor has agreed along with Jack Kubik and myself, that he will stand with in re-addressing this issue. I know that a lot of people say that this is something that's been done for the horse racing industry, mainly the tracks. That's positively not what the task force was established for. It was to improve the quality of the horse racing industry from the breeders, the farmers, the jockey...the jockeys and drivers, whatever

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

it might be. You know...and this split is probably not going to accomplish what some people would like but I think it's going to provide significant new dollars to everyone in this process. Sure there's going to continue to be some people that are disappointed and wishing that they could have participated at the table. But as Representative Kubik has indicated a couple of times already, there was a real diverse group of representatives that did participate along with Legislators Art Turner and Jack Kubik were very active in the task force as it proceeded. There has been representation from the standard bred industry at at all of these meetings. Ι know that Department of Agriculture and their expert in this area has monitored this on a continuing basis. We have been assured that if in fact this is not successful in accomplishing the split, that those people deemed to be reasonable, will look at it again. And you know I appreciate that very much."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Davis."

Davis, S.: "Thank you, Representative. Now, Representative Kubik, I'm going to support this Bill because I think that the horse racing industry and the gaming industries in the State of Illinois are very important to many, many this state. But at the same time, I would ask you Sir if there's a possibility that you could change your from concurrence to non-concurrence to send this piece of legislation to a Conference Committee to...and add on Senate Bill 323 which deals with dockside gambling which is extremely important to myself and to Representative And it's a provision in the dockside Brunsvold. laws that I believe was worked out earlier in the Session and this provision didn't get called. And I would

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

you Sir, our of fairness, fairness to the entire gaming industry in the State of Illinois, to reconsider your Motion for concurrence and possibly offer a Motion for non-concurrence on this Bill. So we could send this to Conference Committee and help Representative Brunsvold and myself..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Davis."

Davis, S.: "I would ask you Sir to consider that and to consider the riverboat gaming industry as well as the horse racing industry. Both industries, which are extremely important to the State of Illinois and extremely important to the residents in my district because I also have racing industry in my district. I have horse breeders in my district and I also have a boat in the City of Alton. So Sir, I would employ you to consider that Motion in all fairness to the entire gaming industry. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "I would like to inform the Body that there are a lot of lights that are lit and I'm going to call you in order as your light came on. So if I'm not calling you right away it's only because your light came on a little later. Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang is recognized."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that you all know that I've been involved in gaming discussions for a very longtime. I am one that believes we should expand riverboats in Illinois for job creation and economic development. There are many that agree with me and yet we've been unable to move this along. Accordingly, I believe that although we need to deal with the horse racing problem in Illinois this should have been done as a comprehensive approach to the gaming situation in our state. All these problems interrelate and so, when we

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

concur on these Amendments, as I believe we will. riverboat gaming or other gaming is expanded in Illinois we're going to have to revisit this. And so I think away it's a mistake in public policy to proceed although I will tell you I intend to vote for this concurrence Motion. There have been problems in the horse race industry between the track owners and the horsemen and of course between the track owners and the riverboat people. This attempts to do something about the problems between the track owners and the horsemen. And I support it because it begins to take a step, I support it because it does something, I support it because most horsemen will tell you well this is better than having nothing. But in fact does not go far enough to resolve the problem because our insufficient quarantees for the horsemen, the ag people, the people that bred, the people that grow the feed, the people that train horses. The host track system should be abandoned, it's confusing. Thoroughbreds are projected to receive 70 to of all the simulcast revenues, while they only 80% contribute 52 to 55% of the waging revenues. There should 55/45 split written into the law. Now those of you that haven't really read into this don't know exactly what But suffice to say that there aren't I'm talking about. sufficient guarantees here for the harness horseman. harness horseman may suffer as a result of the passage of House Bill 2108. Further, we should not allow owners to make all the simulcast decisions unilaterally. If we do this because of the split we could reduce the number of harness races in the state, live harness races, from over 100 to down under 50. The horseman don't have very much say, if any say, into the simulcast. There should be some kind of a joint decision. Since 1986

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

track owners have increased their percentage of total commissions by over 50% while the horsemen have had their percentage decreased by 12%. If live racing is to survive in our state we must find a way to remove the track incentive to push fans away from live racing and push them into the OTB's. The plan is excellent for Fairmont and I completely support the plan regarding Fairmont Park to keep it open and I think Representative Hoffman will indicate that to you in a little while. However, this plan would allow Quad Cities to remain open in a way that will not guarantee live racing. So the owner of Quad Cities will be allowed to run this as an OTB facility and intertrack wagering facility but we need to expand live racing in Illinois. There are not sufficient guarantees to make sure live racing will continue. There likewise are not sufficient guarantees for larger purses for Illinois bred races, for guaranteed numbers of races for Illinois bred horses and we need both of these to guarantee the continued viability and...and improvement of business and of horse racing and horse breeding in the State of Illinois. The surcharges in this Bill are the task force recommended. In fact there have been many changes from what the task force recommended. would report that few, if any, Democrats have had much to do with the final negotiations that have put the final Bill in place which in some areas is substantially different from the task force report. And so, I'm not going to take anymore time and ask no one else to yield to me. I support the Bill because it's a step, it's not a sufficient step. We must return to this issue next year or even this fall to insure live racing in Illinois, if we're going to help these people, let's help them. Let's not help the track

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

owners at the expense of horsemen. Please vote for this Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, is recognized. Any further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman, is recognized."

Hoffman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, the previous speaker made reference to Fairmont Park. Could you please indicate what is in here regarding Fairmont Park in...which is located in my district?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik. I'd like to announce that the flowers that have been distributed are from the retired teachers and they're in the gallery. You might want to give them some applause. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Hoffman, as you may know from looking at the report, Fairmont Park which I might point out is a strong supporter of this proposal. The revenues that are generated at Fairmont Park will remain there. As you may know, with some other facilities, those revenues are shared amongst the tracks and the horsemen. In the case of the Fairmont Park all the revenues that are generated there, will remain there, but will be split between the track and the horsemen. Special recognition was given to Fairmont Park because of its location and...and frankly from a lot of competition that it has received from riverboats. So I think that this is probably a pretty good provision for Fairmont Park."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that Fairmont also got or in this

Bill two additional off-track betting parlors. Is that

. 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

correct?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "That is correct."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "With respect to the off-track betting parlors. Do you have any idea what Fairmont intends to do with them, the off-track betting parlors?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Well, as you may know, that is a decision made by the racing board. They would apply to the racing board for locations et cetera. So we do not define that in the legislation. We just simply allocate them the licenses."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. And I think I'm in total absolute support of this. I think that what it does is it really gives the opportunity to Fairmont to potentially save itself. We have 3,000 indirect jobs and almost a 1,000 direct jobs as a result of Fairmont in our area. I'm very proud to represent the area and live racing has been a tradition in the St. Louis Metropolitan Area because of Fairmont Park. One of the things that I passed, I believe two years ago now, was legislation regarding Fairmont Park to insure live racing. This Bill in no way affects the...in no way affects that, in other words, the live racing dates that are...that must be run at Fairmont Park would not change as a result of this Bill. Is that correct?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "That is correct."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that in this Bill it...it's my understanding that in this Bill there is some language regarding the live racing dates at Fairmont. It's not the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

intent of this Bill to reduce the live racing dates, it's the intent to insure that the live...the current live racing dates, the number of them are maintained. Is that right?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Hoffman, as I understand it, the Bill provides that...that or requires that Fairmont Park provide at least as many racing dates as they do this year. It does not preclude them from having more but it sets a floor, so to speak, on live racing which, as you correctly know, it is important for that area."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. To the Bill. I stand in support of this Bill. I think that this Bill goes a long way to insure that Fairmont Park, in my district, is going to stay open. horse racing industry in the State of Illinois is something that provides jobs, that has been a long tradition in State of Illinois and I think that this Bill goes a long way to insure and maintain the integrity of the system and insure that we still have the live racing in Illinois. Madam Speaker, if I would have just an additional minute to wrap it up. We...we who support this industry have had a tough time of late with the different types of gambling going forward, including riverboats. This allows us Collinsville and St. Clair County and Madison County to compete with the riverboats and to compete with the riverboats that are presently going in, in the St. Louis That competition is only going to get Metropolitan area. greater. This not only insures that the park is viable but it also insures, even more importantly, that the horsemen get their fair share of property...get their fair share of the betting dollar. That is something that I think that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

for many years has not been safeguarded. This insures that the money bet at Fairmont, will stay at Fairmont. It insures that the live racing dates will be maintained at Fairmont and it insures, I believe, that the track will remain open. Thank you very much."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen is recognized."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Arlington International is in my district and I am...just want to report that, you know, Arlington is probably the flagship of thoroughbred racing in Illinois. And I am certainly dedicated to the proposition survive. It ought to be the flagship of the whole country, if not the world. And if we do things right Illinois we can do that, not only for Arlington, but we can do it for all of horse racing. This is a step in the right direction but I think as far as Arlington is concerned it's kind of a break even. There was some...contrary to some reports where they said they got a windfall, it's just not so, it is about a break even. But I think they feel that while this is a step in the right direction...it needs long term attention. Mayor of Arlington Heights as quoted here in the (Tribune) it says, 'doesn't really deal with the tracks long term needs.' And so I think we have to have continuing work in this area. I commend Representative Kubik for the work he's doing in this area and I 'aye' vote."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,
Representative Currie, is recognized. Any further
discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pugh,
is recognized."

Pugh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Representative Younge."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Younge: "You have been asked to non-concur in order for the provisions of 323 in reference to dockside home base riverboats can be put in here. Will you do that?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, as I told Representative Brunsvold earlier, I am sympathetic to that Bill. As a matter of fact I support the concept. What I want the Membership to understand; however, is that I've been here 11 years and I have to tell you that...ll...in the 11 years that I have been here it's been extremely difficult to get the horse racing industry, the tracks, the horsemen, the breeders, all to come together and agree on something that...that helps the industry. They have done that and they've done it I think in a pretty good fashion. This is a...this is a, for the most part, is an Agreed Bill. There are some people, some small groups that might disagree but for the most part everybody agrees. I believe that we ought to pass this Bill to assist this industry. I understand your concern and I am supportive of that. I'm...but I do not believe that we ought to put this into conference and possibly jeopardize the first opportunity in a long time, in a long, long time, for this industry to receive some assistance. An industry that has suffered, I might point out, because of riverboats and because of other sorts of gaming. So I respectfully understand your request and Representative Davis's request and Representative Brunsvold and I'll work with you and I'm one who agrees that, that's

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

a good provision. But I don't think this is the right Bill to do it in."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes. To say that this isn't the right Bill just hours before the termination of this Session of course is really something. I think that the point of view of the Sponsor should be more broad-minded, in that, we're talking about two parts of one industry, a gaming industry. And it would be better for all the people of the State of Illinois if this question in reference to 323 were included in here and would be better if this...there was a non-concurrence in order to help solve the problems of the boats on the Mississippi River."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Smith, is recognized."

Smith: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Woolard."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative, if I...will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Woolard: "I'll proceed with a question then, Madam Speaker. In your opinion, Representative Kubik, you know, there's been lots of talk about the gaming industry and this being an expansion of the gambling in this state. In your opinion, was this task force set forth to expand gaming in the State of Illinois? Or was this task force single goal and maybe utilization of expansion of gaming to accomplish it but was the real goal of this task force to preserve a industry, the horse racing industry, in this state?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, I think you've phrased that question very

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

well. And yes, yes that is the purpose. When the task force originally convened, the question, the larger question of gaming was agreed to be taken off the table. And the question of...the industry itself and generating revenues from the industry itself were the central question. And how you divide those revenues were also very important. The idea was to generate more revenue and provide more assistance to horsemen and breeders and also for tracks as well."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "There's several provisions that have been discussed throughout this process and I think some of them negatively and I think, for legislative intent, let's just go through a few of those. I know Representative Pedersen or Pedersen just mentioned one of those issues that has been bantered about and is very..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard. May I just interrupt for a moment? We have a message from the Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet Friday, May 26th at 10:45 a.m., Speaker's Conference Room. Rules, 10:45, Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Arlington issue, I know that there was a provision, that there was a surcharge that was going to the track and that was changed and there was a substitute surcharge implemented here. In your opinion, is there a positive gain to Arlington under this plan or is it basically just a break even?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Woolard, as I understand it, it is pretty much calculated as a break even provision. However, it's extremely tough to actually calculate because we don't know

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the full affects of full card simulcasting, so how popular that is and how much is bet on that will have an affect on the revenue generated under that provision."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Representative. I know that there was something in the Bill at some time that I think has left the Bill and let's just make sure that everyone understands the...the telephone betting provision, is this still in the Bill?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "It has been removed from the Bill and it has been removed by Amendment #6, as a matter of fact. So there is no telephone wagering as a part of this proposal."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "I think there was another, maybe somewhat, controversial issue that was in one of the earlier additions, that I think was eliminated but I'll ask and there was some people who had real concerns about the reduction of from 500 feet down to 250 feet to a church or a school or to an area where the residents were concerned about a new off-track betting parlor might be located. Is that still in the Bill?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, the number is 500 feet, it still remains

500 feet for schools and churches. The provision has been changed to provide that when 50 or more registered voters live within that 500 feet, then the majority must approve the location of the wagering facility. In addition to that, in addition to that, local zoning ordinances will continue to control the location of wagering facilities. So local villages and cities still will have the ability to control those facilities and where they're located."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland, is recognized."

Boland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Boland: "One question here, Representative Kubik. How much additional revenue to the state is going to come from the additional off-track betting facilities?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Boland, were you concerned about amount of revenue going to the cities? Okay. respond and then I'll make sure that... I think you're speaking about the provision which, regarding state local tax revenue. What we've done is we've frozen those levels at 94, the 94 level. So whatever the local city or state revenue levels were, they are frozen. Now with the introduction of full card simulcasting and some of other things, we expect an increase in revenue. The next \$11 million that are generated by horse racing, will...that \$11 million will go to purses. Anything beyond that \$11 million will go back to local government and state government. So the idea is to try to keep us where we're at, revenue wise, and if there's a large increase with simulcast to generate some more on-track activity in purses and then give the additional moneys to state and local communities."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Boland."

Boland: "Yes, Representative. Was the...was the issue of slots at the tracks discussed in this...I know it's not in the proposal but was that discussed? In Iowa, to save their race tracks and their dog tracks, they have dog tracks there, they went to allowing slots as a way, not only of saving the tracks, but of producing additional revenue for

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the local governments, for the state. So that we're getting some good out of this rather than just a few fat cats who own all the tracks."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Boland, I know that is the case in other states. Expansion of gambling beyond horse racing was taken off the table at the beginning of the negotiation. So, the idea was the...the industry was going to try to accomplish a couple, of things as I said earlier. One was generate more revenue, create more money for purses, which should result in better quality horses and more racing which is, in my opinion, important. Because aside from the tracks and aside from the betters, this industry creates jobs, it creates jobs for horsemen, for breeders. And the only way that you're going to do that is to increase purses and bring those horses in and try to improve on-track facilities. So that...we limited the discussion to those items and felt that the other gaming issues would only serve to probably divide the group and we could not reach a consensus. So while you're point is important and it's well noted, I think it was not a part of the negotiation."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Boland."

Boland: "Well, Representative, I think right now I'm going to support your Bill because of the...it's the only thing and we do need something to help the whole ag industry that is dependant upon the tracks and we want to keep the tracks alive and so forth. Unfortunately, there's really nothing in there to help the track in my area get back live racing, the Quad City Downs, except for slots at the tracks. I agree with Representative Lang that really we need to put this into a whole comprehensive package, we should of had the dockside issue in there. We're going to be not only

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

losing jobs, although not the greatest number in my neighboring district to Representative Brunsvold, his district is going to take the biggest hit. But we're going to lose jobs in Alton, in East St. Louis and so forth, due to the competition from Iowa and Missouri. I think that also, you know, we should have looked at Secretary Ryan's proposal in-depth of more boats and strategically located boats so that we could generate more state revenue. So that we could put it into absolving this Medicaid crisis in a couple of years. Unlike his...what his estimates that we had four years, we could have done it in two years due to the federal contribution. And then..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, bring your remarks to a close."

Boland: "Yes, thank you. Then we could have put this money into education and begun to solve some of these problems that have left 140 plus school districts on the financial watch list. Again, most of them downstate but we're going to begin to see some in the collar counties and the Cook County area due to the cap...the tax caps. So we should have looked at this on a comprehensive basis. I hope we go back to it. This is a piecemeal approach. Unfortunately it's the only thing on the table, so we're probably going to be left having to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, is recognized."

Skinner: "There are two expansion of gambling in this Bill, as I understand it. One is to allow pari-mutuel betting at county fairs for the first time, which is certainly going to change the image of county fairs. And the second is, allowing 14 new off-track betting parlors. Is that correct?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, Representative, that is correct."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Skinner."

Clerk McLennand: "Attention. Rules is meeting immediately in Speaker's Conference Room. Rules, immediately, Speaker's Conference Room."

Skinner: "Well, that's too much for me. Thank you very much."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak, is recognized."

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "Representative Kubik, does the Department of Agriculture that is certainly involved heavily with this Bill, do they get any extra purse money to dole out to the various industries? I see you have my good friend there, Jim Reynolds, I'm sure he could enlighten you to that question."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "No. As I understand it there is some redistribution within the standard bred purses, within standard bred purses. There is a redistribution, it's a slight one."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Well, is it not a fact that the county fairs will receive more money from the department under this legislation, larger allocations?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, it is my understanding, that the...that they will receive some additional revenue but it will be through the standard bred purses. So..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you. Representative, could you be a little bit more specific?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Novak: "You said...will those county fairs that...those county fairs dealing with just standard breds or don't all county fairs, won't they all receive a larger allocation from the state as a result of this legislation?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, as I understand it, there are 42 county fairs that do some standard bred racing. They...because of the racing and because of the purses they will increase...they will see an increase in dollars. But those that do not do racing will not."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "That's satisfactory, I appreciate that. And there's 14 new OTB's. Correct? Fourteen new off-track betting parlor authorizations?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Okay. Could you read to me this language in the Bill that deals with, I'm kind of confused about it, transporting breeding genetic material. Could you read that into the record?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I'm feeling more like Representative Hartke everyday."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "No. I asked him to read this into the record Miss, Madam Speaker, please."

Speaker Wojcik: "Okay, Representative. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Well, it...there is a provision that deals with standard bred breeding programs that would allow for the transport of fresh semen within the state for breeding purposes."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Novak: "Did you steal this part of the Bill from Representative

Hartke? Didn't he have a Bill like that about genetic tax

breaks for genetic materials?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I know that Representative Hartke, really wanted to present this Bill because of this provision alone. All the other stuff didn't really mean a whole lot but knowing of his ongoing interest in this sort of legislation he was besieging me to present this Bill. But I thought the other provisions were extremely important and although this one is important, I'm sure Representative Hartke can speak to this portion of it. But..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Representative Kubik, I appreciate that and thank you for reading that into the record. It is certainly an important aspect of the Bill. Is there a tax deduction for transporting these breeding materials?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, there is no tax deduction for this
 provision in the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Kubik. Representative Novak."

Kubik: "Maybe...Madam Speaker, maybe next year Representative Hartke can come back with a Bill that will provide a tax break for this provision. But in this Bill, it's not a tax break."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I certainly rise in strong support. I am one of the Co-Sponsors and I certainly rise in strong support of concurrence in Senate Amendments 2, 5, 6 and 8 to House Bill 2108. The horse racing industry in Illinois is, it's a tradition, it's a tradition that probably dates back to the year 1818 when

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

this state was incorporated. And I know people are concerned about the quote, unquote phrases about the expansion of gambling in the State of Illinois. It does expand off-track betting parlors but horse racing in this state is as American as apple pie. Sounds like a corny statement but this industry in the state..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak, bring your remarks to a close."

Novak: "Very quickly. This industry in this state provides about 40,000 jobs, they're all agricultural jobs. It's a very competitive industry, in light of the lottery, in light of riverboat gambling. I think they should have a level playing field. And for far too long the horsemen have been getting the short end of the stick. And I certainly hope that when we get this Bill the Governor signs it and so we can promote horse racing in Illinois on a more higher level. And I certainly ask my colleagues to adopt these Amendments."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

"Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My name Hartke: used in debate. I want to clarify something. I support this piece of legislation because it does allow for transfer of live semen in the horse industry throughout the State of Illinois. I don't want to confuse this with the fact that a couple years ago I had a piece of legislation that exempt bull semen or semen used from animals in agriculture production for food production in the State of Illinois to be sales tax exempt. It was an attempt by the Department of Revenue to get more money off of an area that should not have been and so I want to clarify that. This...I'm in support of this legislation, it has nothing

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

to do with the tax exemption on bull semen."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Lou Jones."

Jones, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to yield my time
to Representative Woolard."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think we've had a debate and I appreciate very much the Sponsor of this piece of legislation for his indulgence while we were clarifying some things. I'd like to just go to the Bill, if I can, for just a second. You know, I think that there's a lot of people that have a genuine interest in seeing the agro business industry in this state continue to grow and and that's what this is really about. I had a call from an individual the other day in my district and he was a farmer and he wanted to let me know how important this issue was. And I asked him, you know, I said Joe I didn't realize that you were in the horse business. said, I don't own any horses. He said, I'm in the grain business as I've always been. I said, but this is horse racing. He said, yea I know. He said, about 60% of the crops that he raised he sells to the various horse racing breeders and farmers in his area. It's something that stimulates the economy of all of rural southern Illinois and this entire state. It's something that not only creates jobs at the race tracks and the off-track betting It's something that stimulates the economy of this state by bringing people in, to participate in the horse racing industry. Horse racing won't continue, it will not continue in this state, if we don't do things to bring new dollars in to the pot. I know that there's been several people that have been concerned and less

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

satisfied with the amount of splits that they might have been receiving. But I believe that they all genuinely know that we got to step forward because if we step back we fall off of the entire racing industry. We fall out of system completely. This gives us a chance. I commend the Governor first for establishing the task force. т commend those people who participated. I commend the Sponsor of this legislation. Let me tell you what happened just a few hours ago. We met with the Governor, Jack and I and we had some still questions and concerns. He assured us that this wouldn't be the end of this issue. That we'll address it in the future, in fact the very near future if we need to and I think that's important for everyone to know. that have concerns, if in fact this doesn't accomplish those things that we believe to be right. we believe to be good for them in the scenario. That we'll come back and we'll do it again. We'll do it better. But we believe now that this is positive, positive for the farmer, for the agro business industry, for the breeders. the trainers, the owners and especially to those people involved in the racing business. Even the track owners are going to win. The expansion, sure we'd all like not to expand, but what we're doing something is something that's good for all involved. I would encourage each and everyone of my colleagues to join with Jack in concurrence of 2, 5, 6 and 8 Senate Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none.

Representative Kubik to close."

Kubik: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Woolard has made some very excellent points. I realize that this Bill is not everything that everybody wants. But as I indicated

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

earlier, I've been here for 11 years and it's very difficult to get this industry to agree to provisions This Bill gives things for everyone. help everyone. Ιt doesn't give everyone everything they want but that's the basis of compromise, that's the basis by which we brought this Bill forward. I think that Representative Woolard and Representative Turner have been extremely active this process and I would like to thank important in Representative Woolard because he is right, we did sit down with the Governor and we did explain that we do have some people who are concerned about how the revenue will be split. And we had some debates on this, within the context of the task force and they spent, as I understand because we were in Session we were unable to be at those particular meetings, they kept...they debated the split of revenue over a couple of meetings. We could not reach a consensus. So the idea was, let's move forward, let's generate the revenue, let's see where that revenue goes and the Governor has made a commitment to Representative Woolard and I that if the splits are unfair that we would...we would revisit this issue in the future. This is an important Bill. Not for just race tracks, not even the sports fan but as Representative Woolard pointed out, for the agriculture industry. This industry employs, some fashion, over 37,000 people and it's an important industry. I would encourage your 'aye' ... Madam Speaker, if I could just finish my remarks. Representative Turner, who has served on the task force, would like to be recognized in debate to close this issue. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I too rise in support of House Bill 2108 and

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the concurrence of Senate Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8. As Representative...as the previous speaker and Sponsor mentioned, it was indeed a learning experience serving on this task force. It reminded me of the days with many issues here where we set up what we called our...our collective negotiations where all of the interested parties were there. As mentioned, horse racing is a very, very important to this state. My support of this Bill has nothing to do with the expansion, further expansion, of gambling in this state but as mentioned by one of the other previous speakers, this is something that's been around a long time. It not only affects the gambling industry but also has a lot to do with agriculture and agriculture certainly is a strong element in the Illinois economy. And I just urge the Membership to vote 'aye' on the concurrence on House Bill 2108."

Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 2, 5, 6 and 8 to House Bill 2108?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments 2, 5, 6 and 8 to House Bill 2108. And having previously concurred with Amendment 1. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Clerk McLennand: "Attention Members, Rules will meet immediately now in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee immediately, Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Wojcik: "Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 1910."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1910, a Motion to concur with Senate

Amendment #1, has been filed and approved for
consideration."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would like to concur in Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 1910 which is the Guardianship Advocacy...Advocacy Commission Agency Bill. What Amendment #1, does Senate Amendment #1, is it makes two changes. It makes the deletion which we had stated in the original House Floor debate that we were going to make, it amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code to out...the guardianship having to work with the psychotropic drugs, that was already passed and enacted into law, Senate Bill 113, on March 22, 1995. And the other thing that it does, it adds that another person to be noticed, the respondents agent or agents appointed under the Illinois Power of Attorney Act, if any."

Speaker Wojcik: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, is recognized."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative Lang, of course there isn't anything about limos in here but I take your asking in the good natured fashion in which I'm sure your offering it."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Now, Representative, there's been a lot of talk in other Bills regarding the use of psychotropic drugs that's mentioned here. This is different than the other

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Bill, that contentious Bill that dealt with the use of that issue relative to long term care facilities. This is not the same Bill, is it?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan.'

Mulligan: "No, it is not, Representative and what it does actually, it takes the whole section out that referred to that. So, it's no longer even in the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Assuming that we concur in Senate Amendment #1, what are
we sending to the Governor?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Your sending the original Bill minus the psychotropic drugs with the addition of an additional person that has to be noticed because they had added people with power of attorney. So, what it says, is that agents should be noticed...it adds one more person that needs to be noticed."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "What is the cost of this Bill to the state?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "If you'll give me a moment, I'll check in here. If anything it should be a decrease because they are cutting back on...the powers and as many people as they used to...take power of attorney for, they are limiting."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Was there a fiscal note filed on the Bill?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "I can't tell you but I do know and hear what they, I found a Section that says, it will be a decrease in equipment line from \$13,000 to \$2,200 and...I can't tell you if one was requested just by my file. Representative, from what we can tell, it appears that none was requested

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

but quite frankly, what it does, it should make a savings in that agency."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Just an announcement to the Body, the budget is now walking through here if you want to get a quick look at it.

Representative, I have a memo from Guardianship and Advocacy, dated March 20, that if I'm reading it right it seems to indicate a million dollar or more cost to this.

I'm I wrong?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Staff is telling me that it should save and from my overhaul feeling from when I presented the first Bill is that it would now...well I'm losing my voice, excuse me. And maybe it was on the other part of with the psychotropic drugs that was taken out, that it would cost them that much to do that part of the Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Can you assure us that the budget that just walked through here has enough money in it to take care of whatever it is that you're doing?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "The agency had informed me that they had plenty to do it, so I'm...I can only give you that much of assurance, Representative. Perhaps you'd like to stop questioning and go take a look at it."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, as you know, Representative, we've tried for about 24 hours now to get a peek at that budget. Maybe there's someone here that can tell me just about this one line item. I don't think anyone wants me to know about the whole budget yet but, maybe someone can give me some info about this one line item. Thank you, for your help on

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

this."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Flowers, is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "She indicates she will."

Flowers: "Representative Mulligan, is this the...other than the drugs being taken out, is this Senate Bill the original 5232"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "I'm not sure what your question was. I thought you said, other than the drugs being taken out, was it the original Bill. Yes, it is except it added one more person that should be noticed because they increased who could be a representative or for a guardian, in lieu guardian litems office, gave power of attorneys. So, it added that person should be noticed in the court cases."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Representative Mulligan, there was a Section being taken out in regards to people being restrained."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Representative, I don't think that was ever in this Bill and it isn't there now."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "So, I guess my original question was, is this the original Senate Bill 523, or similar to?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "No, Representative. This is House Bill 1910, it always has been 1910. It's always been the Guardianship and Advocacy Agency Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from St.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Clair, Representative Hoffman, is recognized."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Woicik: "She indicates she will."

Hoffman: "Now, Representative, the only thing on this right now is...the only difference as to how this passed House is Senate Amendment #1, right. There's no other Senate Amendments, just one of them?"

Speaker Woicik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "That's correct, Representative."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "And what was the vote when it passed the House initially?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "One 0 four - 0 to 9."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "And does this make a substantial change in the original vote or excuse me, the original Bill that passed the House?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "No, Representative, in fact, it just adds one more person that would be noticed in the matter and better safeguard for the individual."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I see no problem with the Bill. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none.

Representative Mulligan to close."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would accept...or appreciate your 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1910?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

voting 'nay'. 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 115 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1910 and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 1069."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1069, a Motion to concur with Senate
  Amendment #1, has been filed and approved for
  consideration. A Motion has also been filed to nonconcur
  and approved for consideration."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lindner, moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1069. All in favor say 'aye'; all in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This if final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 106 'ayes', no 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1069. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 301. House Bill 301. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, arise?"
- Lang: "Madam Speaker, we've been through this over and over and over again. Shame on you Madam Speaker. We have a right to debate every Motion on this House Floor unless Roberts Rules says we can't. This Motion to nonconcur is...is available to Members to speak on. Perhaps a Member had some important thing to say that would render the Motion meaningless. Perhaps some Member had some debate they wished to bring to the table. You don't have the right, Madam Speaker, to shut off debate without someone making a

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Motion to do that. The Members of this Body should have the opportunity to debate each measure before them. Now, why did you do that, Madam Speaker?"

- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang, we've had this discussion before. You've asked for a record vote. We gave you the record vote. The rules say a record vote and we did that.

  The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow, is recognized."
- Morrow: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I'm glad that you recognized me. I liked to have been recorded as voting 'yes', on 1069. I...I couldn't hit the switch cause I'm talking to a young man about sending him to college. So, thank you."
- Speaker Wojcik: "The Journal will so reflect. For what purpose does the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman rise?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, just an inquiry of the chair. And I understand that this..."
- Speaker Wojcik: "State your inquiry."
- Hoffman: "I understand that the ruling has consistently been, if the Parliamentarian could please...Mr. Parliamentarian, if you could, please. The inquiry is, just regarding the nonconcurrence Motions. We have asked and will continue to ask for a debate. Is it your position that the reason that we're not getting debate is because of the long standing practice in the House to not allow debate or...we don't see in the rules where we can't debate those types of Motions."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, there is no position.

  Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Then...then you will allow us to debate the nonconcurrence Motions in the future. Is that correct?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Cannot guarantee you that, Representative.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Representative Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Well, you're not saying that any rules prohibit it and your not that you, as a Parliamentarian are prohibiting it.

  It's just going to be at the whim of the Chair whether we can or cannot debate issues?"
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, it's a long standing practice of the House. representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, let me tell you what I have in my hand. Let's talk about some long standing practices. I've got in my hand, June 27, 1988, there was a nonconcurrence Motion that was made, I think this is a White Sox park debate and there was a nonconcurrence Motion made by somebody that is still in the House, Representative Johnson. I believe yesterday, he was in the Speaker's Chair when it's been a long standing practice that we didn't allow debates nonconcurrences. Well, I have here about ll pages of debate on a nonconcurrence Motion. Cal, you might even have been here. You might even remember this. Well, a long standing practice of the House, it's convenient for the Republicans when they're here to not allow debate. But, we've always allowed it. We've always allowed it whenever it was asked for. Representative Johnson, who was the Chair yesterday, got 11 pages worth of debate on a nonconcurrence Motion back in June 27, 1988. We have four different examples where we have allow nonconcurrence Motions in the past. It's been a long standing practice of this House, if you ask for a debate, you get a debate and to say that it hasn't been, is absolutely wrong. We have just delivered to the Speaker's podium, reams and reams of transcripts showing debates on nonconcurrence Motions where we have allowed it. From now on, we have a standing request to allow debate if a light

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

is on for a nonconcurrence Motion because in the past we have allowed it to be done. And that has been a long standing practice, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman, while I'm in the Chair,
I will allow debate. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Wojcik: "Your welcome. Representative Cross."

Cross: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm ready...shall I proceed on 301?"
Speaker Wojcik: "Yes."

Cross: "I would appreciate a favorable vote on my Motion to concur on Senate Amendment #1, to the agreed Bill, or an agreed Amendment. It came out of the Senate, I would be glad to answer any questions, if I can."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, is recognized."

Lang: "Madam Speaker, apparently...apparently you...bare with me
 a moment. Let me yield to Representative Hoffman, if I
 might."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates that he will."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, all we did in the Senate is, if you will recall when this Bill was over in the House we provided for reimbursement at 100% for county employees that work for the Division of Probation Services. The Senate Amendment, where we're talking about employees hired prior to 1991, to reimburse them after 1991, we reimbursed probation service employee fully. This is taking care of about 244 employees prior to 1991, that were hired that we're reimbursing. The

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Senate Amendment merely provides for a phase in if that reimbursement. This is a Bill that I've been working on with Representative Mautino, he has been extremely helpful and I appreciate his help and his effort. But, that's...that's all the Senate Bill does, and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Wojcik: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from...I don't have my bifocals on. Representative from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify one of the questions that Representative Hoffman had. The Senate Amendment, this is an agreement and it's supported by the court system and it makes this plan affordable under their current budget and it was at the request and through negotiations with them, this provision was put in. I stand in support of it, it will benefit all the detention homes throughout the State of Illinois."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, I too, am in strong support of this Bill. As a former director of probation and court services in St. Clair County, we also ran the detention center in St. Clair County. Under state law it indicated that the state was to for probation and court service employees, unfortunately, it was willfully under funded, has never been done and detention homes that were opened up later, were getting more reimbursement than detention homes who had been with the state for many many years. I think that this is a vitally important...important job...important in that, what it is doing is, it's allowing the reimbursement at a 100% level on...in the future. And I too, would just like to commend Representative Cross and Representative Mautino, this is something that is vitally

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

important to our county, is vitally important to many peoples county and when we talk about the problem with juvenile crime and we talk about how. Representative Black's concerns, how you have to transport individual juveniles in this state from, you know, from Vermilion County all the way to St. Clair County on many occasions because there is no place to stay. This allows the diem to be reduced because we're getting more...we're getting more of reimbursement from the state. So. this will be cheaper for all counties in the state to insure that there are juvenile beds available and it will save money for various other counties. I urge an 'aye' vote. I would once again commend Representative Cross and Representative Mautino, on this Bill."

- Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky, is recognized."
- Schakowsky: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. On House Bill 1069, I wasn't able to get to my switch and I wanted to vote 'no' on the Motion to nonconcur and I was hoping that we would be able at least discuss somewhat, the Amendment in the Senate which was one that would have enabled...that would have protected victims of incest and sexual assault..."
- Speaker Wojcik: "Representative, the Journal will so reflect that you wish to vote 'no'. Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Cross to close."
- Cross: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a good Bill, it's been worked on by a good number...large number of people. I would appreciate your support. Thank you, very much."
- Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 301?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 301. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 41."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 41, a Motion to concur with Senate

Amendments 1 and 3 has been filed and approved for
consideration."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker, I would move to concur..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder, excuse me, there has been a request to divide the question. Please call Amendment #1. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker, proceeding on Senate Amendment #1
this is similar to, no I'm sorry, it's identical to House
Bill 2307, which passed committee 10 to zero and wasn't
called for Third Reading before deadline both of which have
now passed out of committee for your consideration. This
grants the Commerce Commission authority to establish rules
for competitive telecommunication carriers. The rules
would apply to standards of service, accuracy of billing,
and to equipment and plant safety for the protection of
customers. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky is recognized."

Schakowsky: "Excuse me and inquiry of the Chair there are two..."

Speaker Wojcik: "State your inquiry."

Schakowsky: "There are two...Senate Amendment #1 and #3 only?

Okay we are doing...I do have a question..."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "We divided them, Representative, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Representative, I'm sorry I am in charge of this Bill and I didn't get to my desk until just now.

Could you just repeat briefly what Senate Amendment #1 does?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker, Senate Amendment #1 is an Amendment Bill for the Commerce Commission. The provision is exactly the same as House Amendment or House Bill 2307 and it deals with establishing rules for competitive telecommunication service."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "So this Amendment has nothing to do with the Open Meetings Act. Am I correct?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "You are absolutely correct. We will talk about that when
we discuss Amendment #3."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you I have no further questions on Amendment 1."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang is recognized."

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

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I know that there are a lot of people that have some great concerns about Amendment 3 and most of us have been focusing on that. Can you again briefly tell us what Amendment 1 does?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Amendment #1 grants the Commerce Commission authority to establish rules for competitive telecommunication services.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Without these rules competitive telecommunication carriers have no incentive to provide accurately measured service and overbilling can and does occur."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Any chance you could tell us that in English. Some way we can understand what your Amendment does, Sir?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Be glad to Representative, as know in you the telecommunications industry it is the most rapidly changing industry in our nation. In order for the Illinois Commerce Commission to keep up with those changes we have what was created after the Ma Bell decision in which local service was separated from long term service and now we have systems in which local services want to compete in the long term area but they will allow local competition. telephone, what I call telephone lines, which is a very unscientific term, being used for the transmission of information beyond my wildest dreams. In order to accurately provide services to customers or more importantly for customers to receive accurate billings. We need to have rules to be able to do this and these rules will be in the following area. The accuracy of billing for services, health and safety of telecom employees customers and requirements for refunds for billing overcharges. Three immanently desirable goals think."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, Representative, I'm sure you know that Representative Kubik and I sponsored a Bill that would have promoted more competition in local telephone markets. Does this...is this an opposition view to that or would this work well with that approach?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative I can tell you that it is not an opposition to your Bill. I am unable to tell you if it works well with yours. I truthfully don't think that it involves it one way or the other, but thank you for sponsoring a good Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well I'm wondering if you've discussed this Bill with Representative Kubik and if he's had any commentary to you regarding whether this does or does not mesh well with our Bill."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative in our very brief conversation about this and many other Bills he said that this was a good Bill and he would ask you specifically to vote in favor of it."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well you've got me convinced, Sir, thank you."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak is recognized."

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "Yes, Representative. Is the Amendment still in here that deals with the Opening Meetings Act?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, the Amendment we are discussing is

Amendment #1 it has no relationship to the Open Meetings

Act. We are going to talk about that in just a moment in

Amendment #3."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Okay but the underlined Bill that the Amendment is on, still has the reduction in the number of members on the commission from seven to five?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Again, Representative that is Amendment #3 it's not the underlined Bill, it's Amendment #3."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Excuse me, Representative Ryder, I'll get back to that later than. I'm sorry."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens is recognized."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Motion. Excuse me, excuse me I wanted another Amendment I apologize. Thank you, Representative Ryder."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "Thank you. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Wojcik: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 41?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 41. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker on Senate Amendment #3...thank you Tony. Senate Amendment #3 is the one that was alluded to by previous interrogators on the Amendment would reduce the membership of the Illinois Commerce Commission from 7 to 5. We have a unique circumstance in which within 30 days there will be two vacancies on the Commerce Commission. As a result this is our opportunity to down-size government. To reduce the work within...excuse me reduce the number of commissioners from 7 to 5. We can

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

do that without losing anyone since two people, one has already left one is in indicated their intention to leave, and we can do that with the savings of some \$400,000, 426 to be specific. The majority of the states in the United States have three to five. Illinois is only one of three that has seven. There is an issue concerning the Open Meetings Act and I'm certain that we'll discuss that during questions. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak is recognized."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Wojcik: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "I believe Representative Ryder, on the Amendment that I
was wishing to speak to. Why is the Open Meetings Act been
changed with the respect to meetings of the Commerce
Commission?"

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we have this problem, because the Open Meetings Act is very clear about what's called a majority of a quorum. A quorum in a seven person commission would be four. A majority of a quorum would be three, which means that two people could talk to each other in the commissions situation. They could talk about a case could say did I hear this correctly. Is this theory right? They could make a decision much like judges in a Supreme Court make a decision after they've heard testimony. Commerce Commission is unique among agencies because of their very strict rules of posting of notice. They have a formalized process of hearing testimonies, submitting of documents, court recorders, making transcripts. So it's all very formal, all very structured."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Novak: "I'm sorry, Ma'am. Thank you, Representative, for your comments. You know there are units of local government in Illinois that have five members and they have to follow the Open Meetings Act."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I apologize, Representative Novak. I was caught in a pause and the Speaker thought that I was concluded. leading up to the conclusion but I was not quite there yet. So that there are lots of municipal bodies, I happen to represent a couple of counties that are commission form. So they have three commissioners. Under the rules of Open Meetings Act and it's been zealously quarded by Attorney Generals that a majority of a quorum meaning two of the three is a majority of a quorum in fact two of the three is a quorum. I also represent some municipalities that have five members on the city council. A majority of that, a quorum is three, a majority of a quorum is two. So that it is a violation of the strictest sense of the Open Meetings Act for two members of a city council to talk to each other about city business. It's a violation in a strictest sense of the Open Meetings Act for two members of the county commissioners to talk to each other about county business. That's fine, the counties and the municipalities have learned to deal with that and I think by and large they do it fairly and they do it within the spirit of However, in the industrial commission it's closer to a judicial or an appellate decision than it is a local form of government and in addition they are appointed not So in this sense I believe there are logical reasons why allowing discussion by the commissioners one on one has sense and create the exception, but we didn't want to do it behind the scenes. We wanted to do it up front

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

and in dealing fairly with the issue, so as a consequence we placed into the law this exception. Now it's not meant in this sense that they are doing something in secret they their decisions. Their decisions are, to my knowledge, always done in writing and it's either majority minority opinion. It's much more of a circumstance and in that limited, very limited way, we are proposing an exemption to the Open Meetings Act. I believe that the Press Association is very concerned about this and they are clearly within their rights. For purposes of legislative intent, let me be very, very specific. This exemption is only to the Illinois Commerce Commission this Sponsor clearly and specifically does not intend this exemption to provide any incentive or any opportunity for any other municipal form of government or agency other than the Illinois Commerce Commission, to be able to meet as we describe it. If I could state it more strictly I would. It is only for the Commerce Commission and I do not mean to give any encouragement to any other organization that has three or five members or something like that. This is only for the Commerce Commission."

Speaker Wojcik: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Representative Ryder, I have the utmost respect for your integrity and the upmost respect for your veracity dealing with this Bill and I would not imply, even a hint of implying, any impropriety about what the Commerce Commission wants to do but I have to disagree with the changes made in here. The Commerce Commission is such a sensitive commission. It sets utility rates for consumers in the State of Illinois. Now when the Gentlemen from the Commerce Commission approach me and said, Representative Novak we want to reduce the size from 7 to 5. Gosh that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

sounds like smaller government. That sounds like spending less dollars. Then I said okay I'll support it. found out that they aren't qoinq to reduce the appropriations or the money they used commissioners. The five commissioners will gobble the salaries of the two that are going to be deleted from the board. Then we find out about this exemption to the Meetings Act. This commission is so sensitive and we all know from all of our constituents the criticisms that we receive from them about Commonwealth Edison and about all the other utility companies going before the commission and the commission's decisions that have been made the decade of the 80's. We need to defeat this Amendment. We need to defeat this Amendment and I ask colleagues to vote no to concur Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Dupage,
Representative Cowlishaw is recognized."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we should all be aware of fact that the Illinois Press Association is opposed to this Amendment and I think for good reason. To exempt the Illinois Commerce Commission, simply because it would now be a smaller board consisting of only five people, from the provisions of the Open Meetings Act that require public bodies to make formal announcements when a majority of a quorum of the body is meeting and discussing official business is not only a bad precedent, it is bad public policy. Now it might be so that there would be some inconvenience involved on the part of the commissioners if they were not exempt from that requirement, but, according to Dave Bennett of the Illinois Press Association, that is the price officials must pay for being on the Illinois

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Commerce Commission. Ιf this exemption is granted, according to Bennett, it is only a matter of time before every five member group from county boards to city councils will demand the same exemption. A prior speaker has made a very good point about this exemption from allowing a majority of a quorum to meet privately and that is, is perhaps no public body is all of Illinois that is more sensitive and more scrutinize by the public than the Illinois Commerce Commission, which after all approves rates that our taxpayers have to pay when they pay their utility bills. I believe that the material submitted to all of us by the Illinois Press Association, the four point open meetings alert, perhaps we should look most carefully at number four. On that list number four reads, 'this terrible public policy sends a message to the taxpayers and rate payers of the state that it is okay to discuss publics utility business secretly.' That is not what we should be about. Ιt is not only the Illinois Press Association that is opposed to this. I am confident that the people in your local newspaper offices back home also opposed to this. I stand in strong opposition to Amendment #3 to House Bill 41 and I urge every Member of this Chamber to vote 'no'."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens is recognized."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Motion. The last couple of speakers talking about the Open Meetings Act have tried to give you some compelling reasons to oppose this legislation and I'm sure that their thoughts are heartfelt but they are a little bit misinformed. First of all it should be pointed out that it was the Commerce Commission members who stepped forward knowing that should two of them

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

get together for lunch and one of them simply ask have you seen this year's budget for the commission or ask a question about policy at the Commerce Commission over lunch, even inadvertently or any related matter. that they would be in violation. They did not notify the press that they were going to lunch for goodness sakes and one of them just happen to say did you hear about our They would be in violation and so what they and rather than violate the law they wanted to clarify the law and so they stepped forward and said, not for the purpose of conducting official business we won't have meetings of two just to discuss business, but for the purpose of reacting to practicality. For goodness sakes, Ladies and Gentlemen. If they happen to take the train home together and say 'boy that was a heck of a case we had before us'. they would be in violation of the law and that is not the intent of the Open Meetings Act to notify the press that we are taking the train home together tonight. The purposes legislative intent, I would tell you, that Amendment is specifically to prevent two members violating the law if they discuss any matter concerning public policy or budget or related matters at a meeting that is just a casual meeting. Maybe a backyard barbecue maybe riding the train together. This morning's newspaper talks about..."

Speaker Wojcik: "Any further discussion?"

Stephens: "Madam Speaker, I am not finished. This morning's paper talks about the fact that the Illinois Press Association says that this is a terrible thing and we ought not allow this, but if we don't all this, this highly publicize critical organization is going to be barred from even going to lunch, even going to lunch with one other

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

member. They should be applauded for stepping forward and wanting to do this right and not criticized. This is not a violation of the intent of the Open Meetings Act. This is a simple clarification that makes common sense. They should be applauded, this should be a yes vote, this is a no brainer and I appreciate the fact that the Press Association and honorable group is concerned about this, but in this one they have it wrong Ladies and Gentlemen I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook,
  Representative Shirley Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Jones, S: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Jones, S: "Yes, Representative Ryder does this Bill only reduce the Board to five? This do not have anything to do with the public utility people, this is only dealing with the Illinois Commissioners. I, myself, support this Bill. I support this Bill. The reason why I support this Bill is worked along with the Illinois Commerce because Commission. They are fair with the people and I everybody on this floor to vote yes. Also they had a member that's retiring now that worked very closely afro-american members. Ms. Simmons worked eleven years with them and she was a Director of the Illinois Commerce Commission and I urge everybody. Why should we keep seven members on the board when two members aren't there already? It's been vacant for over a year, so why not have a five member board? This does not have anything, I repeat, this do not have anything to do with the utility people. Commonwealth Edison, Ameritech or et cetera. Please vote

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

for this Bill, thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook,

Representative Currie and by the way, Representative

Johnson in the Chair. Representative Currie, proceed."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. I rise in strong opposition to the concurrence motion on Amendment #3 to House Bill 41. Not because I think that there is something inherently wrong with the idea of reducing the size of the Illinois Commerce Commission, but because I strenuously oppose the exemption that's contained in this Amendment from the Open Meetings Act. Currently the law in the State of Illinois is that a majority of a quorum may not meet to discuss public business. That law would apply not only to, not only does apply to the Illinois Commerce Commission, but to numerous boards and commissions across the state. There is nothing wrong with that law and although a previous speaker seems to find it might be onerous, what he ought to do if he thinks that is to introduce a Bill to change the law for all governmental units not just this one. There is nothing wrong with two members of this commission or any other local government unit from meeting to play golf to have lunch, what have you, the only prohibition is that they may not discuss public business. The irony here, the irony here is that the chairman of the Commerce Commission himself a former journalist. You would think he of all people would be anxious to make sure that the Open Meetings Act would still apply. I don't believe there is anything in this Amendment permitting ex parte communication between members of this Commerce Commission and those who have business before the Commission although, we know that legislation has been introduced to do just that and we know

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

there was a scandal, not very many years ago, when it developed that a member of the Illinois Commerce Commission was involved in a substantial, a substantial line conversations, telephone conversations, eх communications with one side of the people who had cases before the commission. So I think we are looking here at the thin edge of the wedge. Either your for the Meetings Act or you aren't. If your for the Open Meetings Act you vote against this exemption because this is only the beginning of the effort to exempt and exempt and second you are dealing with a commission whose very nature it is to raise suspicions and questions about propriety of it's actions. We have seen the ex parte communication issue, rise before with this commission. are just asking for trouble. We are encouraging bad public policy and a bad message to the Commissioners of the Commerce Commission if we say yes, they may be exempt from the Open Meetings Act with respect to the majority of a quorum issue. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Adams, Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The question in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. And on the Bill the Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate what one of the other speakers had to say about me. I don't appreciate the whistling..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could have the decorum, rules of the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

House complied with respect to the audible additions...Representative Ryder and I'm sure Representative Lang would appreciate it so, Representative Ryder, proceed."

"Thank you. This Bill is one on which reasonable people Ryder: disagree. It seems ironic that someone mentioned the current chairman of the committee ٥f the Commission. He sat with me in committee when this Bill was Sat with me and indicated his support because presented. he understands just how ludicrous it is that he cannot talk to another member of the commission without someone suspecting that there is some kind of evil cabal between two of them that are going to suggest that they are making They are the ones who are suggesting because they are trying to live within the law. They are the ones sat at the table and suggested up front that they wanted this exemption. Now we may disagree exemption and indeed we may and your vote will reflect that. But let me also indicate that when you do that, that the proposition before us is to down-size a commission, to down-size staff and to reduce the cost of state government by over \$400,000. You got a chance to make a difference. You got a chance to save some money. I would ask for your support to save those funds and I would hope that you would vote 'aye' on this Bill, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentlemen from Jersey, Representative Ryder has moved that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 41. Those in favor of the Motion 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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

are 42 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House has failed to concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 41. And this Bill, having failed to receive the required Constitutional Majority...the Motion is lost. Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker even I can understand those numbers so as a consequence I would ask that we not concur on Senate Amendment #3. I would ask the Bill to be sent back and I will ask the Senate Sponsor to remove the Amendment."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Ryder moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 41. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 'yes', none voting 'no' or 'present'. The House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 41. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, page 6 of the regular Calendar. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 368. Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could give the Gentleman your attention, just as we have every other Member.

  Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would...Mr. Speaker, I would move to adopt the First Conference Committee to Senate Bill 368. The Bill has two provisions, those provisions affect the property tax limitation law. The first provision would be a provision to allow for the issuance of limited bonds. The second provision would be to allow for the...the

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

issuance of what we call alternative bonds. A limited bond is a bond which would...what the first provision does is to set a cap in the 1994 year for bonds and that cap could not raised unless the voters of the district go referendum. The alternative bond concept is one which will government money. local What the alternative bond concept does is to take a stream of revenue, for example, motor, fuel tax and use that to put forth a bond issuance. That motor fuel tax would be backed up by a property tax and although the property tax would not be levied, it would serve as sort of an insurance policy against the default of the bonds. The reason that this is done is to allow for a lower interest rate on bonds, on what is an alternative we enacted tax caps in Cook County and in the collar counties, when we did that earlier this indicated that it was important that we look at potential modifications to the tax cap. These are two modifications which I think are entirely appropriate and within the spirit of the Property Tax Limitation Law. I think that these provisions provide no tax increases to homeowners and I would certainly respond to any questions. Would appreciate your support of Senate Bill 368, First Conference Committee Report."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Two things before proceeding. First to recognize the Clerk for purposes of an announcement. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "The House Rules Committee will meet at 12:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room. The House Rules Committee will meet at 12:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Secondly, we've had complaints from the back row that it is difficult to hear the speakers and the questioners, so we could break up some of the caucuses and

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

make sure that all unauthorized personnel are removed from the House floor it would expedite our proceedings greatly. Thank you for your cooperation. The Chair recognizes on Representative Kubik's Motion on the Conference Committee Report, the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie. Proceed."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to the Conference Committee Report. measure provides for loopholes in the property tax cap that many of you voted for just a few short months ago. I myself was not in favor of the property tax cap but I know that many of you think that was perhaps the most important thing we did this Session and for collar counties in This measure, this measure which never was discussed in the Revenue Committee pops up on the last day of Session and it's an effort to give local governments thousands of local governments in Cook and the collar county, all of them, park districts, library boards, municipalities, forest preserves. Give everyone of them the opportunity to go out and raise their rates. The cap says, 5% or the CPI, whichever is lower. This measure says, forget the cap, go to your bonding limits in 1994, no matter how much that means you'll be raising the rates for your homeowners and for your businesses. The second part the Bill, the alternate bonds, it may be good public policy to say let's exempt them from the limit. It may a good idea but make...make no mistake, it is an exemption, loophole in the tax cap. You have to pledge revenue volume, you have to pledge real estate bond...moneys. Behind those alternate bonds, whether you use them or not is not the issue but you are exempting those real levies, exempting them from the property tax cap.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

indeed be a good idea to let districts use their 1994 bond limits so they can go on with capital construction projects. I know the park districts are hurting, I know the school districts are in trouble. The libraries need your help too. But the point, Speaker and Members of this House, is that if you help them you're hurting your homeowners. Make no bones about it, this is exactly what we're looking at today, a loophole in the property tax cap and when you're organizing your literature for your 1996 fall campaign and you're putting right up there with the big ones, I capped your property taxes, don't forget to tell them that you voted for Senate Bill 368 at the very same time."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton..."

Currie: "I would like...Speaker..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "...I'm sorry. Proceed."

Currie: "Speaker, I'd like to ask for a verification should this measure receive the required Constitutional Majority."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Your request is acknowledged. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report for two reasons. In January we adopted the new House Rules and we heard a great deal of discussion about how we were going to bring sunshine to the process of the House. How sunshine would pour in on major policy decisions. How there would be no last minute Amendments. No last minute Bills at the end of Session. Plenty of time for discussion, plenty of time for committees, plenty of time for the public to be allowed to testify to come into

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

committees. Plenty of time for the public to let they feel on these very critically know how important issues. Well here we are in the last day of Session and we're seeing one of the major policy issues of this state addressed in a Conference Committee Report has never seen the light of a committee hearing, that has never seen the light of day in any public forum. Let's not be hypocritical Ladies and Gentlemen. I heard a great deal of discussion from that side of the aisle of how important it was to you, to open up the process. And now here we sit a major, major exception to the vaunted issue of property tax limitations. You are going to raise homeowner's property taxes if you adopt this Conference Committee. You are going to tell your homeowners you increase their property taxes without any prior notice, without any public commitment, without any public hearing. You are the ones who said, we need property tax caps to protect our homeowners. You are the ones who said, that I didn't vote for property tax caps because I think it's important that we have that decision. Let the locals but no we had to enact this great policy and now you're just going to shoot it full of holes. Well what we really stand for? Do you stand for property tax caps or do you stand for exceptions to your great and glorious law? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue deserves public consideration. This issue deserves the public comment. This is not something that comes out of committee or comes out on the floor with no public discussion, committee hearings, no ability for the public to comment. This flies in the face of your rules, this flies in the face of what we're trying to do in this Body. And I would recommend a 'no' vote for the homeowners in your district

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

and for the public at large because they deserve the opportunity to be heard."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering. And if we could give Representative Deering your attention it would be appreciated. Representative Deering, proceed."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will."

Deering: "Representative, these new limited bonds that is created in Senate Bill 368. Are these backdoor referendum bonds?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, the concept of limited bonds, which I might point out, was a concept that was...that was looked through on a variety of occasions. The concept is, that whatever your bonding authorization is for 1994, which is this year, those bonds...that bond authorization would be frozen. And what it would say is that, you could not go beyond that bond authorization without a referendum. It would allow for the reissuance of bonds if you went below that level. So if you are at your 1994 level it is capped, so this is a cap on bonds."

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

Deering: "So then, Representative, as long as they stay under the ceiling they could have a revolving bond fund that property tax, or I'm sorry, property owners in these counties with the tax caps could never have a say if they want to reduce or if they don't want to pay for these bonds? So, for instance, if they issue bonds at the 1994 level and in the year 1999 if they fall below that level, by say a million dollars, they can reissue a million dollars worth of bonds and the taxpayers will have to pay those bonds without

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

having any say so in the referendum process, is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "As I said earlier, it places a cap on the bonds. If they go below that they can reissue the bonds. But the tax, the homeowner, the tax bill that they received this year is the tax bill that they will continue to receive on bonds. Because it does not provide for an increase in taxes because it is frozen at the '94 level."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Well, I think that while in your statement technically may or you theoretically may be correct that it doesn't increase your taxes. But technically their taxes will never go down because these taxing districts will continue to issue these bonds so it may as a property or homeowners in these tax cap counties will never have an opportunity to pay less taxes. Now let me ask you another question, Representative. There was much a do about the referendum in the November 8th election that passed in Cook County for tax caps. And your side of the aisle brought that to light numerous times throughout the debate. me, in that referendum, was it so worded...was it so worded a way on the ballot that said, we want property tax caps with the exception that we're going to six months down the road exclude or exempt park districts or any specialized taxing district, was that so worded like that in the ballot?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I think the ballot...I would answer your question in two ways. I think that the referendum said, should there be a cap on the growth of property taxes. This falls within the spirit of the law. As I said when we had the original

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

debate on House Bill 200. This...the purpose of property tax caps is to limit the growth of property tax...property taxes and this falls within the spirit of that law. And I think that, that is the provision that is contained in this Bill. So this will fall within the spirit and the letter of the tax cap law and will insure that the growth of property taxes will be at either 5% or the rate of inflation, whichever is less."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering."

Deering: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think the spirit of the tax cap law is plain, cap your taxes. You campaigned in the last election how we capped your taxes, your taxes are never going to go up. We know that was not true. There were many of us that didn't support the tax caps. You have a Member on your side of the aisle that's trying to be the champion of downstate tax caps, the Gentleman from Madison. Tax caps don't work, they have been a sham to the taxpayers and now by coming back to Springfield trying to exempt special taxing districts from the cap I think just further proves it. This is a bad Bill for all the downstate Representatives. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to just refresh some memories or clarify some things about tax cap legislation. The property tax caps limit tax increases, they permit tax increases. This Bill prohibits tax increases. I know that's hard to understand sometimes. But the proof of this is, when Members of the other side of the aisle votes on tax caps, if they vote 'yes', they vote wrong. If they

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

vote 'no' on another Bill we got in tax caps, they still vote wrong. Maybe we should have tax cap therapy seminars so that the other side of the aisle, while there's still some of them here, can learn how tax caps operate, what they are, how everybody in the state wants them. speaker says downstaters should vote 'no', fine. Run around your districts and tell everybody, downstaters shouldn't have tax caps. You don't understand the issue. It's very simple. We have a lot of friendly people over here who will be glad to explain to you how tax caps work, is a good Bill. It absolutely prohibits tax increases while the original tax cap law okay's tax increases. Sounds crazy, no, but it's true. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang. The poster boy of the  $\underline{\text{Chicago}}$   $\underline{\text{Tribune}}$ ."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me start by saying, I don't know how I'm voting on this yet. I know we've been talking about this for a long time, I really don't know how I'm voting on this yet. But there are some comments I would like to make. I'm opposed to tax Members on the Republican Side of the aisle, who caps. champion local government, should also be opposed to should have never had the tax caps in the first Not because we're not interested in property relief but because we're interested in local control. If we funded education properly from Springfield we wouldn't be worried about property tax caps today because local government would not have to raise their taxes as high as they do to fund schools. That's really the crux of this matter, funding education. Two thirds of my property tax

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

bill in my home in Skokie is made up of education In my school district we got about 5% funding from the State of Illinois. The Majority Party has over times since January 15th, tabled or buried or ignored efforts to fund education first in the State of Illinois. To make...children a priority in the State of Illinois. have an equitable and fair funding plan for the State of Illinois. You've turned down the opportunity to fund education at 50% without one single dime of tax increase. And in the process, that effort would lower local property So what did we do? Instead of funding education to take care of our number one priority in our state which is children. Instead of dealing with that problem head on, we did the politically expedient thing, we did the sound bite approach, we put a cap on taxes. In so doing we told local government you don't know how to do this. You're elected in your local communities but you don't know how to do this. We know how to do this just like we know how to control limo drivers, just like we know how take care of. guns from Springfield. All these other Bills here. We're going to decide that we know best how you should spend your money. And that's what irritates me. I don't know how I'm voting on this, I don't know if a 'yes' vote or a 'no' vote is the right vote for a person who opposes tax caps. I'll tell you this, there's some very strange priorities in this Illinois General Assembly. There are some strange approaches to how we do our job. And those of you who'll listen to me on the floor, I know you hear my voice but I don't know if you'll listen. I'll don't know if you listen to this motor mouth but he says this, this motor mouth says, that when we pass laws in this state we have a responsibility to be consistent. Not for local control on

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

one Bill because it makes political sense and against local control on another Bill because it makes political sense. Not a Bill that says we care about children and all these peripheral ways but we won't reach the heart of the matter. won't go to the heart of the problems with education in Illinois and the heart of the problem with property taxes. The heart of the problem with property taxes is our failure to take care of education in Illinois. The Majority Party on this floor refused to join us in the effort to do that. the Majority Party had done that, we would neither have to worry about tax caps, nor would we have to worry about this Conference Committee Report. Because the problems of property taxes would have taken care of themselves. ٥f you who were in such a hurry, such a hurry, to impose tax caps because it looks good, because it feels good but does not nothing. I say to you, it's time for a little consistency, it's time to worry about the problems the people we represent and not the political problems deal with when we talk about reelection headlines and sound bites. So I ask you all, when you vote on this, to consider what we might have done. What we might have done for the property taxpayers and for the children, the students of the State of Illinois, is to say, fund education because we all know, deep we're going to down inside, even though most of us won't say it. We know that the real problem with property taxes is our failure in this city, when we meet here, to fund education in a proper and equitable way. That's the problem we've reached today. And the reason this Conference Committee is on our desk today is because the Majority Party in this House would not deal with the problem of funding education."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Mr. Clerk, announcements prior to proceeding on the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately in Speakers Conference Room. Rules, immediately. Committee notice, as posted, House Committee on Executive will meet Friday at 12:30, Room 114, consider Senate Bill 465, Conference Committee Report #1. Executive, 12:30, Room 114."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "And we'd also like to extend a Springfield welcome to the Howell Grade School in the gallery. The grade school is the guest of Representative Calvin Giles of the Eighth District. Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the tax cap accomplished two goals. The first goal was that it limited the increase in extension of property taxes each year. But equally important and perhaps even more important was a second qoal. And that is, it ended non-referendum bonds in the tax cap areas. Some have said that this is a...this Bill is a steam valve for the property tax cap. They forget that any tax district can hold a referendum, that's the real steam valve, that's the steam valve that the voters have a vote in. I suggest that a steam valve is involved in this Bill but it is a steam coming out of a steam iron, a hot iron, pressing tax dollars out of the wallets of unwilling taxpayers. Or maybe it's a steam roller crushing spirits and pocketbooks of Cook County taxpayers who have yet to see one dime of benefit from any tax cap that we passed this winter. And who will probably hardly notice any tax relief if this tax cap gutting Bill passes. Referendums already exist under the tax cap, referendums

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

are the real steam valve of the tax cap. We are going back to the old...the bad old days of ignoring voters wishes. This Bill allows local tax officials from park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation districts, schools, junior colleges and municipalities to raise taxes without a referendum. Nobody's told you that yet, right? This is a wake up call for taxpayers. If this passes you taxpayers will know that you...you taxpayers will know that the General Assembly truly represents the tax eaters and not This doesn't create a taxpayers. loophole. This creates a taxpayers sinkhole. This will prevent tax of 1/3 for park districts in the collar counties and 58% for forest preserve districts in Will County, Kane County, Lake County and DuPage County. Now, what do the people say about this? You've heard from the tax eaters. Well I sent out my poll this week and here are the number that want the tax caps...here are the number that want the tax caps gutted. All right, not too many, right? Here are the ones that say no. Now what's the question? The question's about...the question is kinder than what you're going to see on the hit piece. It asked, should the State Legislature chain the property tax cap...change property tax cap to make it easier for local governments, that is, schools, park districts and municipalities, et cetera, to raise property taxes without a referendum? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the answer is no."

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

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Rhetoric is deep in here and I think it's time that all of us that support our schools, our community colleges, our townships, our park districts, our non-homerule

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

communities, the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to stop flooding in our area and the Cook County Forest Preserve ought to stop and think about exactly what this vote's about. Being one of those that were opposed to tax caps, how we're voting for them, this merely allows them to do what they need to do to run their local government. We pass user fees around here all the time. And many people who are against taxes stand up and support user fees and sometime Sponsor user fees. And yet we still hear the rhetoric about what's going on. If you're, it's for your local schools and you're one of those that supported Dawn Clark 'Netch's' 42% increase in the income tax for schools, then you ought to be a green vote on this. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Persico. Proceed."

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

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

Persico: "Representative, as you're well aware, one of my issues
down here and has been for the past few years is the issue
of life safety bonds for schools. Would your legislation
address those concerns?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, Representative Persico, it would. For those districts that have life safety bond authorization this Bill would provide a cap for that...that life safety authority."

Persico: "So for example, if a roof blew off because of a tornado and it was a, let's say they had to replace it for approximately a million, \$2 million and their bonding authority was that much lower over the years. They can

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

then issue new bonds up to their previous levy, is that...is that how this Bill would work?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Whatever their bonding authority is as of 19...as of this year, whatever their bonding level is, they would be capped at that level. If they go below that level they could reissue bonds. They could never go above the cap that is in place on...at this...at this year. But again, if they go below they can reissue bonds."

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

Persico: "In other words, then there would be absolutely no tax increase if this would happen to occur, to the taxpayers of that district?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Persico, there would be no tax increase above this year's tax Bill. So this Bill caps the amount of property taxes that a person pays on bonds, to this year's level."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "To the Bill."

Persico: "This is an honest and a fair attempt to address concerns that school districts have, especially in the life safety areas. We passed legislation many years ago in response to a very tragic fire at Our Lady of Angels School which killed almost 90 children. We require schools to do many life safety projects and yet by through the tax cap and I believe that happened to be an oversight when we passed the original tax cap legislation. Unfortunately over the years its become involved in politics. I feel that many of you here feel that this is an extremely good

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

and fair piece of legislation. Unfortunately and I hopefully it does not get caught up in politics like the Underground Storage Tank Bill did the other night. And I urge a very strong 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 368."

Speaker Johnson. Tim: "There being no further discussion. question is. 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 368?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is This is open. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 368. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, announcements."

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports first. Reporting to Rules...Representative Bob Churchill, from the Committee on Rules. Reported the following Legislative measures that has been assigned as follows: Senate Bill. Conference Committee Report #1, Senate Bill 1039 to Exec, referred to House Floor, Senate Bill 925 - Conference Committee Report to the Order of Concurrence House 1891, Senate Amendment #1. Committee notices. Executive Committee will meet immediately at 12:30, Room 114. Executive Committee will meet at 1:30, in Room 114 on Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1039 and at Appropriations for Public Safety Committee will meet in Room 114. Subject matter only fiscal year '96 budget."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The House will stand in recess until the hour of 3:00 p.m., for purposes of committees. Thank you."

Clerk McLennand: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

#54, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy, Rules Committee. And House Joint Resolution #44, offered by Representative Dart. Rules Committee."

- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order, the Members will be in their chairs. Announcements."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports. Committee Report from Representative Stephens, Chairman from the Committee on Executive. Chairman from the Committee on Executive to which the following joint action Motions were referred, action taken on May 26, 1995, reported the same back, 'do approve' for consideration. Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 465 and Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1039. Supplemental Calendar #1, is being distributed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 465, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

  Representative Ryder."
- Rvder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 485 is the Budget Implementation Act for the fiscal year 1996. It contains in it the substantive language necessary to implement the budget that are proposing this afternoon. It contains within it the language necessary to reduce the unpaid Bills the Department of Public Aid to our medical providers by \$300 million. To reduce that level from 13/13 to approaching \$1 billion. It also contains the language necessary to reduce the assessment paid by hospitals by 1/3 and to terminate that assessment at the end of FY '97. It contains within it clarifying language on the tobacco tax that we used to eliminate the granny tax a couple of years ago. Language that was declared a problem by the Supreme Court and reduces again a tax from 20% to 18. Those funds will then be used to help pay the Medicaid debts that we

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

There's many other parts of this Bill, many other pieces of it that implement the budget for this fiscal year. Some as major as changes within the Department of Children and Family Services and the managed care portion of providing services for indigent. Others as simple changing the name of the Governors Purchase Care Board to the Illinois Board. We just finished 2 and 1/2 hours of committee work on the budget and implementation and which many questions were asked. I look forward to the opportunity to answer those questions and more this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I move to adopt first committee...Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 465."

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

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. Just for the record, Representative Ryder, I would appreciate it if I could ask one brief question for legislative intent. On page 185 of this Bill, of Senate Bill 465 in connection with section 14-8 regarding children's hospitals, inpatient hospital rates, and children's hospitals outpatient rates. Is it the intention of this legislation to maintain both of those rates at the same dollar amount that are now in effect?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, unfortunately I am unable to answer that question in a yes or no fashion. There are certain rates that expire as of this year, June 30th of this year and they include direct medical education and indirect medical education capital, disproportionate share hospitals and medical education for high volume. The amount the childrens hospitals receive are a combination of all those and more, therefore I am unable to answer your question

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

directly with a yes or no answer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker, let me see if I can rephrase it and see if it will assist in adding clarity here. If we look on...look in this section that we are discussing right now, I would like to read a sentence and see if we could just get some clarification. Line 24, it says before July 1. 1996, the Illinois Department shall reimburse childrens' hospitals as defined in 89 Illinois administrative code. section 149.50 C3 at the rates in effect on June 30th 1995 and shall reimburse all other hospitals at the rates. I won't finish that sentence Representative Ryder, but what I'm trying to clarify here is, beginning with the June 30, 1995, that, that phraseology deals with specifically childrens' hospitals. The rest of that sentence appears to deal only with all other hospitals at the rate in effect and then goes on to say less the portion of such rates attributed by the Illinois Department to the cost of medical education. So what I'm trying to see if we can clarify is if the beginning part of this sentence in effect we could have really just put a period and ended that there. Do you understand what I'm getting at, I think so."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, the compensation str

Ryder: "Representative, the compensation structure for payments hospitals. particularly childrens' hospitals, is extraordinarily complicated. You and Ι have just demonstrated how complicated that can be and I apologize that I'm not able to respond as directly as you wish. do believe that under this Implementation Act that the childrens hospitals will be losing the targeted access payment and the uncompensated care payment that they had been receiving. The other payments that they have now been

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

receiving or wish to receive, excuse me, I simply can't answer with a direct yes or no. And I apologize to you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Well, thank you, I do appreciate that, Representative Ryder and while many of us have really not had time obviously, to review this in detail I would certainly hope that the department can clarify this just as soon as possible and I hope that I'm reading correctly because it surely should be this General Assembly's intention to keep the reimbursement as it states, 'shall reimburse childrens' hospitals at the rates in effect on June 30th 1995.' So it would certainly be my intention on behalf of this General Assembly that, that be the legislative intention for Senate Bill 465. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Deering: "This Budget Implementation Act, Representative Ryder, how many tax increases are in here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Deering, I just have this hunch that you and I are going to look at this differently. As currently exists Sir there is an assessment that hospitals pay. That assessment is at a 1.8 amount. We are reducing that to 1.25. It's a 1/3 reduction. That assessment will continue at that rate for two years and then be terminated. Currently under the law, a statute on the books, I voted for it, maybe you did maybe you didn't, is a tax on non-cigarette tobacco sometimes called smokeless tobacco. That tax rate is 20, 20%. This Implementation Act reduces that rate to 18% and places in clarifying language as

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

required by the language decision of the Supreme Court. That is what is contained here in."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Well, Representative this hospital assessment for use...for lack of a better word I will use tax, the hospital tax, it's known statewide by almost all hospital administrators as a hospital tax. The consumers pay this tax. It is under current statute due to sunset the 30th of June this year are you not continuing this tax Sir, in this Budget Implementation Act?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we are reducing the rates by 1/3 and continuing it at the 2/3 level for the next two years. You will characterize it as you wish you are entitled to do that Sir. I characterize it as reducing a rate. If you recall the Governor wanted it at 100% and we didn't agree to that, but I would consider that as reducing the rate because I know that those hospitals that will be paying that assessment will be paying on that assessment 1/3 less than they are this very day that you and I are discussing this Bill. Thanks."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one more question.

Representative, you eluded to the fact that we are going to reduce the state's outstanding debt by somewhere around \$300 million down to about a billion. Can you tell me, Sir, when my hospitals and nursing homes will be paid up in full? How long will we have to carry this additional billion dollar debt?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative let me try to explain it to you in this fashion and if my answer doesn't

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

satisfy you, will you ask me to clarify it? We spend, for Medicaid in this state, \$13 million a day, I'm sure that's rounded, \$13 million a day. As we stand here today, the amount of unpaid bills is \$1,313,000,000. At 13 dollars a day that's 101 days. If you were to examine a 60 day cycle, which is normal in this area, a 60 day cycle at a day. That means that a normal cycle, a normal way of doing business 60 days is \$780 million. That's the base. that's the base from which I work. We will cut the difference between a 1,300,000,000 and the 780 million by more than half by the end of FY '96. By more than half by paying off \$300 million and we'll do that and the amount will be approaching \$1 billion. And then we will use the same process in the next fiscal year in order to get down to that 780 or less so that we are paying off those odd debts. But let me tell you the most part, Representative, the most important part is that we are doing that in such a way that we will be able to..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder, the Gentleman is out of time could you bring your answer to a close?"

Ryder: "We're using our current revenues. There's no revenue enhancement here. There's no revenue projection. There's no fooling around with the end of year balance. We're using our current revenues to pay those old debts. And if we maintain the discipline next year we will have a similar amount or more to be able to pay more old debts. That's what we are doing today, Representative."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Pugh: "Representative Ryder, does this budget provide...is this budget below the Governor's promise of the 36% increase in educational funding?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "No, Representative Pugh, it is not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Does this budget contain any transition funds for universities receiving their own boards?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, there are no transitional funds for the independent boards that are being established for each of the universities. There are funds that were taken out of the budget of the Board of Governors and the Board of Regions in order to transition them out of business."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "How much are we talking about for transitional expenses for the University of Illinois to get Sangamon State University transitioned into their system vs. the amount that we are spending in the other universities?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Pugh, the answer is zero. There are no funds in this budget for the transition from Sangamon State to the University of Illinois system. Zero."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "I'm sorry, Sir. I beg to differ with you. I serve on the Education Appropriation Committee and in that committee it was discussed that over \$1 million would go to the University of Illinois for the transitional purposes of transitioning Sangamon State into their system. At the same time, at the same time we were spending less than half that amount for the other universities to make the transition while the budget of Sangamon State was

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

increasingly less than any of the other institutions. Can you justify that? Are you going to answer the first question again? How are we going to approach this? Are you going to answer the first question first and the second question..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Pugh, I think that I was there during part of the time in committee that those transition moneys were discussed and in fact I believe that you passed an Amendment that provided those transition moneys. That was an Amendment that was presented to the budget. That Amendment is out. Those moneys are not in the budget. The universities wanted them. They said give us some more money, we said no, do it out of your current revenues. So the Amendment that you had discussed is not part of this budget, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "So there's no money available for these universities to make the transitions that is necessary as a result of the dissolution of the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents. Is that what you are saying, Sir?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, there are no appropriated dollars for Illinois State University to make that transition to having their own board separate and apart or Northern or Eastern or Western, any of those, Sir. There is, however, a fund established that if the Board of Governors or the Board of Regents doesn't spend it that it might be available and that totals 344,000, but that's not available if it's spent elsewhere, Sir. There's no millions of dollars. We told the universities that if they wanted to do this, have their own boards and they did. We

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

told them then finance it out of your current available revenues."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Thank you, Sir. How much direct assistance to private colleges is provided in the FY '96 under the Illinois Financial Assistance Act for non-public institutions of higher learning?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative there is 255 million through the Monetary Award Program. That money goes to students and then the students can use that money to go to institutions of higher learning including private institutions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh, you're almost out of time
 you have one last question Sir."

Pugh: "Yes, Sir. Representative, can you tell me if the request by our caucus to have probation challenge once again included in the community college budget was addressed, were they included in the budget at all and if not why were they left out?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, that request is not in the budget along with hundreds of other requests for more money that is not in the budget."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh, you are out of time, Sir.

The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "I'm going to use my own time, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry?"

Davis: "I said I'm going to use my own time."

Speaker Daniels: "Of course."

Davis: "Oh, Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Davis: "Okay. Would you explain page 41? It says it required about \$25 less in the monthly cost of child care for adoptive or foster parents."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative that is a rate reduction that was agreed to...by the negotiators."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Who agreed to it? The foster parents? The adoptive parents?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we went to the Department of Children and Family Services and we said to them that they are the fastest growing department in the state. That they have been criticize in some audit findings and we suggested to them that they need to find within their own budget the ability to pay their bills. They cooperated with us and they said that when they negotiate, when they negotiate contracts within their jurisdiction that they will attempt to achieve the savings that you see listed on that page to which you make reference."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Returning to the question that Representative Coy Pugh asked. The Illinois Legislative Black Caucus made the request that probation challenge be funded. The amount was \$250,000 last year. It's a program, a mere \$250,000. The program offers educational and job skills to young adults. Why would this program be left out? Why?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative the program to which you make mention is a program that was placed in the budget last year and not spent. Representative, it is not in the budget this year for this reason. There were literally hundreds of requests

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

for new or expanded programs in this budget. The easy part of budgeting is to say yes. The tough part of budgeting is to say no to good ideas. And I believe your idea is a good one, but I had to say no as did other people, agency directors and others, I had to say no to lots of good ideas and we did. This budget pays old bills. The budget lives within the revenue projections. It doesn't indicate growth in the areas that you have and for that Ma'am I am sorry."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "I appreciate the ma'am, but I'm Representative Davis. Mr. Ryder that was an excellent program. It was not a program, it was a program in a community that needs educational skills and work skills. And to cut program is truly criminal. My following questions I'm going to ask all at once. The state runs two security advocacy programs. One in Public Aid and the other in DCFS. Both of these programs assist individuals in securing social security or SSI. Which of these programs is 100% federally funded? Question #2. In the Public Aid Code Amendment all references to the program are changed from mandatory to discretionary by striking words shall and inserting may. Why? What the department's intent regarding the adult advocacy SSI Is it to continue at the same budget as fiscal year '95? Will it go up? Will it go down? Why? the Department of Children and Family Services intent regarding the children's social security advocacy program? Will it continue at the same level as '95? Will it go up and down? Why?" And why are we balancing this budget on the backs of poor children?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, just nod, you were talking about the SSI

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

advocacy areas, is that right? There are funds still within the budget for that perhaps not at the level that you wish. Representative, let me be specific to this. There are several areas in this budget that you and I are going to disagree and I understand that and I respect your position, but let me just tell you now and I will be happy to be as specific as I can later on. We said no to some programs, in fact we said no to a lot of programs because we are living within the means of this budget. For that..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder, the Lady's time has expired could you please bring your answer to a close?"

Ryder: "I was simply going to indicate to the Lady that I'm sorry that we don't have the funds to accommodate everybody's request for everybody's program, but this budget doesn't do that. This budget lives within the revenues that we have."

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

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"
Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Ryder, I just have a couple of brief questions, Sir. I noticed that there is a provision that changes the requirement to transfer the excess funds into the Education Assistance Act pursuant to the Riverboat Gambling Act, that no longer will they be required to transfer those funds except from time to time. What is the specific time requirement for the transfer of these qambling funds into our schools?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm sure that you and I have had some town meetings together and I...or town meetings, not together unfortunately, and at every one of those town

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

meetings I have been asked about the lottery money going into education. Now folks aren't as educated about the gaming money that's going into education but we decided to forestall that and we have made that transfer, not from time to time, but we have made that transfer by this language just the same automatic transfer as the lottery does."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And with respect to the tobacco tax, Representative, it's my understanding that the tax we are imposing on tobacco is double the amount that was currently in effect. That in fact it's going to raise \$18 million this year not the 9 which was assumed two years ago and that we were doubling the tax."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm not going to tell you today how much money that's going to raise because we didn't have an experience factor on that when we...when it was voted for. I won't indicate whether you voted for it or not, I had that opportunity to cast that vote, but I don't know how one can say that since we are reducing the rate. The rate was set at 20 and we are reducing the tax rate. So whatever it raises at 18% is going to be less than whatever it would have raised at 20%, but I'm not going to tell you what it is because I don't have a factor, an experience factor to be able to tell you that. All I know is that we are reducing the rate. Tax reduction."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Representative you are reducing the rate, but you are expanding the base on whom it is calculated. You are doubling the tobacco tax, Sir, you are not reducing it you are doubling it. And let me

## 70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

tell the Freshman Members on the other side of the aisle what else might be in here they might be concerned about. There are going to freeze the rates for your nursing homes. They are going to repeal the Prompt Payment to cost your medical providers another \$30 million by not paying our bills. For those of you who want to pay our bills on time. We fought long and hard to make that the state law that is now going to be rescinded, another And your going to extend the nursing home \$30 million. tax, tax on the elderly that's good news. you indicated to Representative Deering that there will be a change in perspective on how this is viewed. Well you remind me of the old story about the New York Mets. In 1962 with Casey Stingle. They had a young pitcher they brought up from AAA, started his first game. He immediately walked the first ten batters. Stingle trudges out to the mound tells the kid he is pulled. The pitcher, this 19 year old pitcher, goes into the dugout and sits down next to Marvelous Marven Thornberry, throws his glove down and looks at the old first baseman. Thornberry looks at the kid with compassion and says, kid it will better. Well the pitcher looks back at Thornberry, this rookie, and says, what are talking about? I had a no hitter Ryder, you remind me of that young qoing. Well, Mr. pitcher. It's not only a no hitter, this Act strikes out. They increase taxes on nursing homes, providers, the state not paying it's bills. This is an embarrassment to responsible and accountable government. This is a new Majority legacy in the Illinois House. Don't pay our bills, let's stiff people and put it on the people next year or the year after that. That is not responsible government, that is not what this House should be about.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

We are taking the approach that yes we are going to be responsible and the state should pay it's bills. No more borrowing, let's get to the heart of the matter. Let's make state government responsible for a change."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Hanniq: "Yes, You know a little bit earlier today we debated a Bill the Purchasing Act and it reminds me of an earlier time when we debated a Budget Implementation Act and everyone thought they knew what the Bill did, but low and behold one of the unknown or little known provisions in that Bill was a provision to repeal the Purchasing Act for the state And that happened about three or four years ago and we have been unable to get the provisions to protect the taxpayer rewritten into Illinois law so I would say to my colleagues especially the Freshman on both sides of the aisle to take a very hard, close look at this proposal which authorizes any number of things many of difficult to pass on their own and many of them very unfavorable to our constituencies. For example we heard about the tobacco tax. Now there had been a tobacco tax enacted by an earlier legislature but that had been struck down by the courts as unconstitutional. So what we have here today is a new tobacco tax. A new tax. And we have a hospital tax. Now if we do nothing in this Body that hospital tax that's on the books today will sunset. will expire on June 30th, but we are enacting a new hospital tax today so we have another new hospital tax and the same thing is true with the nursing home tax. It will as well expire on June 30th if we do nothing, but we have a new tax on nursing homes. The Prompt Payment Act that we

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

passed last year and promised to our hospitals and nursing homes that we will finally begin to pay them on time that is scheduled to begin and to become part of our law on July This Bill pushes back that day to some uncertain time in the future that may or may never come if we continue to push it back. So it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen that there are a number of things in here that we need to be concerned about. I am told that there is some concern from our side of the aisle that people that are going into nursing homes or community care in the Department of Aging people who have serious...that are...have problems that are going into programs for the disabled at DORS that they may very well see under this proposal assets being consumed by the State of Illinois now, being taken by the State of Illinois now. as opposed being to their children are on to purposes that they wish them to be spent on. So I suspect that there will be senior citizens calling you up in June and asking you what it is that you voted for on this budget implementation Bill? We know and I think we've debated a little about how this eliminates the Department of Public Aid Assistance Program and it provides and eliminates the medical assistance for adults in the areas of dental. optometry, podiatry, and chiropractor. So we know that there will be those who will lose those services under this provision. We know that the proposal that is in this that has to do with pharmacies is opposed by every pharmacy that I've talked to in the State of Illinois and I'm sure that your pharmacist will tell you that they are not in favor of this Bill. So it seems to me that the reason that we're being asked to vote on this Bill with very little consideration, with very little opportunity to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

examine this hundred page plus document is because the Members who are proposing this Bill and asking us to pass it today don't want us to know all the provisions that They don't want us to know that there are these provisions that will hurt the citizens in the State of Illinois that we represent. So I would ask the colleagues on my side of the aisle, actually I would ask colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not support this business as usual proposal. To me it seems that a no vote is the clear message that we need to send to the Governor people and let them know that we demand a new and the direction because a yes vote today for this proposal means have already forgotten the message of November. It means that we have already become part of the problem and not part of the solution. The direction of state finances will be determined today and I think it's time that we choose a new direction. I think that it's time that we vote no on this proposal, send this back to Conference Committee and ask the conferees on both sides of the aisle to gather together and try to find something that we can support and that we can enact without hurting people of the State of Illinois. So again I would ask Members on both sides of the aisle to take a very hard. close look at this proposal. Make sure you know what you're voting on because it's not sufficient to tell constituents I didn't know what I was voting on when you cast this vote. You have an obligation to know what voting on. I would urge you to look at it and vote 'no'."

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

Morrow: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I yield my time to Representative, Coy Pugh."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Pugh: "Representative Ryder, back to the higher education portion of the budget. Is it true true that the budget contains a \$3 million request in agriculture research?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Is it also true that the final budget will fund this research...these research grants based on or using cuts from the Minority Achievement Grant and from the Consortium of Educational Opportunity Grant?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "No."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Where will it come from?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative I'll tell you where we got the cuts out of this program. I'll tell you where we found the money to pay our old debts. We went through this budget using cuts. In some cases we eliminated, in some cases we pared down programs. We went through this budget and we eliminated commodities and travel and vacancies and cars. In order to get the operational. The grants and other cuts necessary to pay our old bills so we took cuts out of a lot of things, Representative."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Representative Ryder which public universities are receiving the largest and smallest increases over FY '95."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Ryder: "Representative, do you wish that is dollars or a percentage, Sir?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "In dollars."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I think in terms of dollars that it's obvious that the University of Illinois does. It's the largest university in the state and it receives the most dollars increased. I believe that the percentage of increase in relatively appropriate across the lines. I would suggest that the smallest state institutions, meaning the smallest state schools, receive the smallest dollar increase..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Representative, do many school districts lose general state aid funding under the Republican scenario?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative we put \$196 million into the elementary and secondary education, 40 million of it goes to the general school aid. Approximately 80 million goes to the categoricals and the remainder goes to pay our ramp up requirements under the retirement system for retired teachers. Under the general school aid formula, a complex algebraic formula that takes into consideration dozens of factors. There are many reasons why a school district will receive more or less dollars so let me be specific. the pie that we call general school aid, GSA. We are putting 40 million more. We are putting more money into that category, that line is the largest amount that it has ever been in history. Now when you divide out the dollars go to individual school districts some school districts may receive more than they did last year, in that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

line, some school districts may receive less. It depends on things like their average daily attendance, the real estate tax base and lots of other factors, but in order to say whether a school district wins or loses you also have to take into consideration, Representative, the amount that they receive under the categoricals where we distributed \$80 million and those categoricals include such things as technology for success, text transportation reimbursement. So you can't look at the general state aid in order to get a complete picture of the huge amount of dollars that we are putting into elementary and secondary education."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh. Your time has expired Sir, this will be your last question."

Pugh: "Thank you, Sir for your very succinct answers.

Representative, can you tell me what percent of funding does this budget provide for elementary and secondary education? You stated that it is not...we are not reaching the Governor's level of 36%. At what level are we reaching? What percentage of the budget is going toward secondary education?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I answered your question, no, but your question was phrased in such a way that a no answer was correct. Let me specific in responding to you that it does meet the Governor required level of 36%. This budget does reach the required level of 36% of growth as the Governor promised. He kept his promise, we've kept that promise in this budget."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Thank you. Mr. Ryder I wanted to talk to you about the interim assistance and transitional assistance programs. These are programs that together serve 38,000 of the state poorest people, 27,000 in the interim assistance program and 10,000 in the transitional assistance program. These are persons with disabilities often. In any case persons who do not qualify for any other program. People who used to be on general assistance. Now, the interim assistance program, which I understand was initially Sponsored by Speaker Daniels in 1987. Was for...is abolished in this legislation and after September 1st none of these people, my understanding that this program is for people who are awaiting going on SSI, the federal program that will cover them. That this program will be abolished, but that people who are currently on interim assistance may apply transitional assistance. So my first question is, in your calculation, how many people did you estimate would move from interim assistance to the transitional assistance program?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, currently the existing interim assistance case load is 27,800 persons and the existing transitional case load in 9,300 persons. They are going to be folded into a new program, a new transitional assistance and that new transitional assistance would have an estimated case load of 24,000. A reduction of 13,100 clients from the current existing two programs."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "So somewhere 14,000 of the state's poorest people are going to be off of any kind of assistance. I expect that in Chicago and other places like Evanston, where I live, we are going to begin seeing those people on the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

street. But my second question is, of those persons now who would have been eligible for the interim assistance program, are they eligible to apply for the new transitional assistance program?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, of course they are, 24,000 of them we estimate will be in the new program. The 13,100 that we anticipate will be not eligible for the new program are the ones that aren't going to be here. A very large amount are those who are claiming substance abuse as a permanent disability, those who are a part of the program on one year because they didn't learn to read."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "This is so frustrating because we just get a look at this and there are so many important questions to ask. We have had absolutely no input into this budget and we are talking about the poorest of the poor. I want to get to the TA...the Transitional Assistance Program, which was a safety net for unemployable people. My understanding is that now we can lower the payment levels at any time if the budget is insufficient to provide for the established payment level so we don't have any obligation any longer to those 24,000, whatever, 38,000 people. Is that true?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Schakowsky, I don't expect that you like this portion of the budget. I understand you views and as a result I think that the attitude that you are expressing is one that is genuine for you. Allow me to say we made a decision, we made a decision to pay the bills of those people that provide services, to those who are medically needy and financially indigent..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder, the Ladies time has

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

expired. Could you bring your answer to a close please."

Ryder: "And as a result we made some tough choices eliminating and fazing back this program was one of those tough choices."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens. Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Jones: "Representative, in regard to the part of the budget, DCFS the relative caregiver...correct me if I'm wrong, I think it states that if you are not licensed by September 1995 then your grant goes from DCFS to AFDC. Am I correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, you are correct. We are attempting to avoid the competition with the financial incentive that one has by providing the same care for a child to game a system in order to obtain more money for the care of that child.

But your statement, Representative, is correct. You are right."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "So what your saying that if a home does not qualify, qualify to be licensed under the guidelines of DCFS that child will not be removed from that home even though that home does not qualify to be licensed, but what will happen is the grant will be reduced because the grant is much lower in AFDC than it is in DCFS. In fact I think it's about 46% difference. I don't know if your aware or not that some of the relative care givers are grandmothers are 65 years old on fixed income and they have their grandchildren and when you reduce that grant and put...say for instance this grandmother has been living in this

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

home...would pay attention Representative. This is very important. Say this grandmother has been living in this home for 30 years and her home does not qualify to be licensed, but she is taking care of her grandchildren. You are going to reduce her grant because her home does not qualify but your not going to remove the children. To me if the home does not qualify then you should remove those children and put them in a home that do qualify."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder..."

Jones: "Are you aware of that?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative let me tell you a couple things that I very much aware that this is a extraordinarily important issue to you and I applaud you because you have always kept this issue very much in the fore front of understand that and that's why I do pay advocacy and I attention to you when your speaking. That's why I understand that it is an important issue to you. And I apologize, Ma'am if you thought I wasn't paying attention. That was not the case someone was trying to give my information at the same time I'm listening to you so I not mean any disrespect by that happening. What we have is a situation in which we are trying to control the numbers of children that are treated by the Department of and Family Services and one of the ways that we are doing that is asking, asking extended families to help. And one of the ways we are trying to help them is to suggest if you don't qualify for the higher standard, but you still want to keep the child that we'll move the standard so that can continue to have the child at lesser rate of compensation, so that we can do what I know is absolute goal and that's to try to keep that child in a

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

family environment and we would like to move the children in that fashion. I hope that this program is successful in doing that but we are going to have to have the help of the families to do it. And I know that you will be first in line to try to help those families do that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Representative, I understand what you just said, but in doing this the way that your doing in the budget now because some of the relative caregivers are on fixed income these children will go back. They will go back to DCFS and come out of the foster care homes. And that's going to make you load that much heavier in DCFS because some of the relative caregivers are not able to care for the children on a reduced grant so in doing this you are just making the load that much heavier of DCFS. I was at a hearing a month ago over 400 relative caregivers testified and there were grandparents there whose homes do not qualify and they are going to have to give those children back to these..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative, could you bring your line to a
 close please?"

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and you are absolutely correct I do have a vested interest in this and I think that is a poor way. I think what they are trying to do, I think that they are just trying to reduce their own budget and put it somewhere else. And when you do that you can not assure me that that's the best interest of the children. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put.' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. 62 'ayes', 52 'noes'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Ryder."

Rvder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the questions. especially appreciate the comments of the last lady. I am certain that even though she has stated that she has vested interest that she is voting her conscience today cause I know that's what she intends to do. For those who suggest there's two different versions especially for my friend on the other side of the aisle that gave me the baseball analogy that I didn't quite understand. I understand what that's going to go on here, but let me suggest that there's a couple of roll calls. There's a roll call here of those folks who voted in favor of the assessment. roll call here of those folks that voted in favor of the tobacco tax and when those votes were taken that increased We understood it, we make revenue. that decision. But we are not talking about increased today, we are talking about reducing taxes. We are talking about reducing the assessment by 1/3 reducing the cost of hospitals by \$100 million we are talking about reducing the tobacco tax by 20% to 18%. Now if you want to spend that, you go right ahead, but we are meeting the obligations of the State of Illinois. We are standing up to bat and we are taking our hit because we're here to do the business of the state. We are participating, we are producing a result. If you don't like it you can vote no that's your obligation, but for those of us who wish to be responsible I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate

Bill 465 and the adoption of First Conference Committee

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Report. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. This issue having receive 64 'ayes', 53 'noes', and the Motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 465 is adopted. And this Bill, having receive the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 925, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 925, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the budget of the State of Illinois. This is how we decide to spend our dollars over the next fiscal year. It says that we live within our means. It says that we pay our Bills. It says that we downsize state government. It says that we eliminate programs. It says that we eliminate, so that we can focus on the very core of what it is that we do for this State of Illinois. More money that ever before, to education. Paying off \$300,000,000 of old debts in medicaid within this years revenues. Let me tell you what this budget is not. There's no one saying, we've got extra revenues let's spend it. There's no one saying, let's spend down the end of year balance. There's no one saying, that there is extra laps spending that we'll push off till next or the year after. Real dollars, real cuts, real Bills, a real budget. I move for it's adoption, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."

Turner: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman, yield for a question or two?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Turner: "Could you tell me, is there anything in this budget for the children in the public schools of the City of Chicago?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, let me be real clear on that one. There is more money in this budget for elementary and secondary education than has ever been appropriated by the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago, the worthy students of the City of Chicago, receive the shares through the categoricals, the shares through the school aid formula and it's my hope that they receive more money than they've ever received before."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Could you tell at what...you know, in terms of the overhaul percentage. At what percentage would you say that we're funding education at in this state? What percentage of the budget?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, if by you question you mean to ask or to imply, are we spending through the State of Illinois an amount that is more than 50% of the total amount of dollars that's are spent on education in this state. I will tell you that we are not. If however, you're asking me, are we spending more dollars through the State of Illinois, than we've ever spent before, I'll tell you that we are. This year, I struggled along with my son to understand 8th grade algebra and I will tell you, that the amount that we spend on education in this state is a factor of two variables. The first one is the amount that the state spends, and we're spending more money on education today than we've ever spent in history, and the second is the amount that the locals contribute to education. When you add those

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

together and we only control one variable on that equation and I'm proud that we're putting more money in education than ever before."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Yes, it was my understanding that the year before the election that the percentage put in general state aid was over 4%. As I look at the numbers here and I haven't had a lot of time to look at them. It appears it's only about 1.7% over last year and I think that that still shy of the 36% that the Governor, mentioned in his budget as he said that he was going to fund towards education. So, it's still shy of what the Governor, initially proposed. I have another question regarding DCFS and, in fact, I just got a call like many of us will be getting, in regards to group homes. What's the percentage, or what's the dollar amount in regards to group home funding?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I want to answer the first part of your question, first then I'll be happy to give get to the DCFS part if I can. You mentioned percentages at three different times in your conversation. Let me be clear about it. As a percentage of new growth and revenues of the State of Illinois, we're keeping commitment to meet the 36% that the Governor, indicated and we're spending it on elementary and secondary education. Now, if you're going to suggest that as a percentage of the total, we're not putting as much into the general state aid as a percentage as we did last year. Anytime you add to the base, if you add an exact amount the next year, it is going to be smaller because the base is bigger. That's 8th grade algebra. But, we're spending \$40 million more on general state aid than we did last year. And more than the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

year before and the year before that. We're spending more money in general state aid than we have in the history of this state. So, to suggest that the 36% or 3% or the 1.7, your mixing apples and oranges, Representative, and I know that you didn't mean to do that. And now, I would like to answer the DCF question if I could have just a moment. Representative, for group and institutional care homes for the Department of Children and Family Services, we're spending about \$280 million of which approximately \$60 million is from general funds, GRF. General Revenue Fund."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner, your time is almost expired. Could you bring your line to a close, Sir?"
- Turner: "I believe, Representative Jones, is going to yield to me but I...I do have, two other questions. One of them deals with, I don't want to spend a lot of time on general..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay, Representative Turner, now your operating on the time given to you by Representative Jones, so you can thank her."
- Turner: "Thank you. I don't want to spend a lot of time arguing inflation, I mean percentages but there is one thing, one fact that I think we ought to keep in mind, and that is that inflation certainly makes a difference and I don't know if the Gentleman, has considered inflation and what impact it has in terms of the overhaul percentage. The other question that I would like to ask, and I'm one who has a sizeable, I'm going to say a sizeable number of disproportionate share of hospitals in my area, but what does this budget do for disproportionate share of hospitals?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, let's be real clear here what we're doing. Let's set it out there and let's set it straight.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

For those hospitals that are paying the assessment under this budget, they're going to be paying, paying 2/3 of what they are paying today. So, that 1/3 that they had they can put in their pocket and help other folks that are needy. For those that are receiving the shares for various add-ons the programs that were not to expire on June 30, 1995, that continues. They are getting what they did before. But for those who are receiving the add-ons, the additions, the over and aboves that are due to expire on June 30, 1995, that would have cost this state \$200,000,000 more. We don't have the money to pay those. We're paying our bills and we're not making promises that we can't keep. we provided \$30 million, the Department of Public Aid will spend it, therefore, it will be matched for a total of \$60 million that will then be distributed in a methodology to try the best we can with those limited funds to create a safety net. To try to help catch those that are in the worse. That provide the most as best as we can and those that aren't going to get all the dollars that they want, I'm sorry. And if some of those are in your district, I'm truly sorry. But let me tell you right here and right now that we're paying what we can afford to pay. We are limiting what we can afford to do, and let that message go out far and wide that, that is the policy of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Representative, do you know how many hospitals in the City of Chicago, will probably close as the result of this budget and I know that's probably speculation on you part. It's my understanding that the hospital in your district even with this paying what we can afford is going to lose a million dollars. Am I correct? Two hospitals I should say

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

in your district will lose over a million dollars as a result of this budget."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

"Representative, I don't intend for hospitals to close as Ryder: a result of this. But, let me suggest to you that the economic conditions of the market place and the delivery of medical services is changing faster than you and I can imagine, and if those changes, produce changes in a situation so that a hospital that was doing something is no longer competitive, that's the market place in which we currently live. There are...I will tell you there are hospitals that are going to be hurt by this budget. understand that and if we've been spending money artificially keep hospitals in existence that were not economically viable. Let the message go out that, that is If we were spending money to provide services that we can't afford to provide, let the message that, that is changing. To those hospitals that are in my district, and, Representative, let me give you one I have had a hospital close in the district represent. A very fine hospital. A hospital that would have served had it been in existence, my father. So I know what it causes to a community and I don't wish that on any community and my heart goes out to that community and any others that may have that happen. But let's be real clear We're living within our here what we're doing. We're saying we're only going to pay for so much. suggesting...we are suggesting that this state has limited resources and we should live within those resources."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner. Now your time has expired Sir, is there further discussion? The Lady, from Cook, Representative Currie."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This budget is a disgrace. This budget is a disgrace for the people of the State of Illinois, \$33 billion, four taxes and what do we get? We get a budget that leaves us just under \$1 billion in debt to providers of health care for the poor. We have a budget that will not adequately reimburse hospitals and long-term care facilities serve the poor. The ones that are at risk, Speaker and Members of the House, in this budget are not the hospitals that are empty, they are the hospitals that are full with poor people. With our own clients. This budget means a rate freeze, a rate freeze that has already been in effect for 18 months. This budget means absolute cuts in payments to children hospitals like Larabida. To other hospitals that serve the poor in Chicago's, south and west sides, to hospitals in East St. Louis, the hospitals where the live, not the hospitals in the suburbs. We will see hospitals close and those hospitals are likely to be the hospitals we depend upon for the infrastructure to provide health care for people who are on the state's welfare Thirty-three billion dollars and we've turned our roles. entire Public Aid Department from 'shall' to 'may'. longer do we commit to interim assistance, no longer do we commit to transitional assistance, to people who are in No, no, no. We'll leave that up to the department. That, Speaker and Members of the House, I suppose is what is meant by one party rule. You can all trust each other. The Republicans, in the House, trust the Republicans in the Senate, trust the Republican Governor, on the second floor to do what you want to do and when you run out of money, as you will, you'll stop doing it. To say to people that there is no right to support from the state when they meet

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

certain criteria, that is wrong, Speaker and Members of the House. That is wrong. This budget, \$33 billion and four taxes later will not do the job, will not take care of the neediest people among us, the most vulnerable citizens in the State of Illinois. Speaker and Members of the House, this budget is a disgrace and the only responsible vote is 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "We would like to welcome to Springfield, the students of Lovett Grade School in the gallery and they are guests of Calvin Giles, from the 8th Districts. Welcome to Springfield. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Representative Ryder, Speaker. appreciate your comments but I'm not going to ask you any questions otherwise, I'll never get the microphone back. So, let me just comment on the budget, Sir. Ladies Gentlemen of the House, it's very difficult to talk about what this budget does in terms of success in taking care of people, because it doesn't. Our state, our credit worthiness has been reduced three times in four years. Never happened before in the history of this state, modern history, modern times. We've borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. Now, with this budget we're going to borrow some more. We're going to the markets and we're not going to go to where we should. We're going to go to the medical providers and borrow from them by not paying our Our credit worthiness will be lowered again. The state is in the bottom 20% in the country of fiscal stability. This is the path that we're going down, this is the path that we should stop immediately, but this budget does not do that. We are lowering our ability to fund education, the state's share has gone down again, our local property taxes will go

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

up again. For example, Representative Klingler's, Her state share in the school aid formula for her district will go down by over a million dollars. million dollars in Springfield alone for elementary school students, local and secondary. What kind of priority that? Hospitals closing, people suffering and we're borrowing more money. Ladies and Gentlemen, this budget does not face the situation squarely, we are not making the tough choices, we're doing tax increases and more borrowing. We have to face the challenge. We have to face the ultimate responsibility of where we are headed. Gentleman on your side of the aisle, that portrait, he was a Member of this great Body and he made the statement years ago that we will not be remembered for what we do here. will be remembered for what we don't do here and what we're not doing today is facing a fiscal crisis. This will be your legacy, not ours. Ladies and Gentlemen, for the first time in the history that I remember of this Session will be remembered by it's partisanship, its less responsibility to the people, turning our backs on the people, questionable actions, potential fraud, robbing the downstate road fund, taking illegal acts to rob the downstate road Representative Bost, Representative Jones, taking \$15 million out of the downstate road projects. I'm sure you'll be interested to hear that, or maybe they didn't That is what this Body will be remembered for. you. Never have I ever seen a Session so marked by this type action. It is a sad commentary on this Body. We used to work on a bipartisan basis, that is no longer the case. used to work together on a budget, that is no longer the We have worked on your agenda, an agenda against working men and women. An agenda that puts deviousness

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

ahead of policy implementation. We have divided this state by pitting the suburbs against downstate, by pitting the suburbs against Chicago. By pitting one unit of people against another for scarce education dollars. That is your legacy. We don't look at the long term solutions, we don't look at the long term goals of what's good for the people of this state. We look short-term and how to divide people. We based this Session on regionalism, partisanship and short-term political gains. That does not serve the people of this state well. Ladies and Gentlemen, House, this budget exemplifies this Session. nothing to help to resolve the long-term problems It refuses to face up to the problems of education funding, medicaid funding and serious policy Ladies and Gentlemen, of the House, you will be remembered, this is your legacy, a budget and a Session of inaction, partisanship and deviousness..."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady, from Cook, Representative Kaszak."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Representative Kaszak.

Budgets are about priorities, they tell us what is most important to the policy makers of this state. So, I would like everyone to make sure that you know what you're voting for. That you're able to go home and tell your voters, that what this state can afford is \$800,032 million to house 41,700 prison inmates, that we can afford \$155,000 for each of 15 beds to incarcerate juvenile offenders, that we can afford new boot camps and new prison libraries but then you tell them we can not afford \$493 million or 36% of

## 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the GRF that would go to education, \$493 million that the Governor, promised publicly to put into education. Is this priority and is this the budget you came Springfield to vote for? Go back and tell the voters that afford \$12 million to pay people who've sued the state, because the state can't follow it's own laws. Or \$281,000 for the salary package in housing allowance for the managing director of DCCA's Tokyo office or \$900,000 in travel for the Department of Insurance. But we can't afford to reimburse urban hospitals such as Mount Sinai or Children Hospital, such as Larabida so that thev can continue to treat poor and sick people in need, that they have to cut services and maybe shut their doors. Tell your voters that we can't afford \$160,000 for no-bid. computer service contract with former employees or \$5 million from the Public Aid budget for an out-of-state company that did nothing. that stole the money from us. that's First Health or \$30 million for cronies of the Governor, for bad hotel deals. But we can't afford the doing business adjustments for mental health community providers. A dimes worth of increase for home delivered meals for senior citizens or for victims of sexual assault. We can afford \$20,000 to test race horses cocaine, \$20,000 for limousine rentals for the Department of Public Aid. Limousines. \$20,000 for limousines, \$800,070 in rents for \$140,000 building and over a million dollars for parking spaces. But we can't afford more than 15 hours of treatment for those who seek help for drug addiction and we can't continue one of transitional assistance for the poorest, of the residents, of this state. For the indigent and the disabled and illiterate adults. We want \$62 million to cut

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

from them, the very poorest people. So, go ahead, go to your districts and tell the voters that you support all these things. Then you tell them why we can't afford to pay for services for children and for the elderly and for the sick and for the disabled and even so, we still can't afford to pay our bills or to meet our obligations. Shame on you for voting for this budget and shame on you for proposing this budget to us with no opportunity for inpute. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Saltsman: "Yes, Representative Ryder, we just met about a short hour ago and you said you'd have an answer for me and the answer to the question is, is the entitlement that we put in this General Assembly two years ago, for \$8 million money, the entitlement, to replace the money spent for the state retirement system. For the state police, taken from the pension system and this entitlement we owe for the next seven years. Can you ask me what that money...where that money is going to be transferred from, to put that money back in the pension system? We owe about five more years of it, I think."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I have...I've been advised that when we pass the continuing Resolution, it was last year I believe, was it not? That each year it's the Comptrollers Office, that certifies the amount of money necessary to go to those retirement systems in order to meet our requirements to ramp up the system to be fully funded. Now, I understand that takes a long period of time and we're just finishing

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

our first year of it, but we are finishing our first year and that the Comptroller, has indicated that the amounts that you seek are being addressed by the funds that are being transferred by that continuing Resolution."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Well, that was not the intent when this legislation was drafted, this entitlement was suppose to be, to put in money to cover the early retirement of them people who contributed very little to it. That was not the intent of it and I still think that under law that we can force the Comptroller, to sign that check for \$8,000 for the next five years. To put the money into that system that committed to, if we don't do it we're wrong and I'll be checking this out within the next six month to year to make sure and for the next four or five years that this entitlement. that we owe that system, if we don't pay it back we've robbed the state retirement system again. was a commitment and it should come of the revenue from the state police."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, you're very strong advocate for that position and I've heard your words on several occasions. Allow me to simply respond by indicating to you that I am advised that the continuing Resolution legislation, that we passed last year superseded everything prior there too, so that the manner in which we are responding to funding our pensions is through that continuing Resolution and that the obligations therein, are being addressed by the funds that we're transferring this year. Now, you have been and continue to be one of the strongest advocates for funding those pension funds. I've heard you in committee on many occasions and you're to be complemented for that, because

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

what we're doing this year in starting to...in starting to fund, we're not starting to address it, this budget to fund. The under payments to our pension funds that have been going on for years. We're starting to be part of the this in budget and now I understand. Representative, that you don't agree with the answer I'm giving you. But I believe that the Comptroller, is taking into account all of those obligations when the certification is done concerning the amount that goes through the continuing Resolution to pay money into our retirement funds."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Saltsman, your time is almost over, Sir. Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, we started that program with Senate Bill 95, about six, seven years ago with former Senator Dawn Netch.

  It always seems to get side tracked by different legislation."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Saltsman, can you bring your line to a close, Sir?"
- Saltsman: "Yes. I'd like to have another question, if I could." Speaker Daniels: "Go ahead."
- Saltsman: "Okay. Under the road fund, the diversion of road fund dollars to the state police again, this is a perfect example why 95% of the Members of the House of Representatives, had nothing to do with this budget. In a Public Safety Committee meeting, we passed an Amendment Sponsored by the Republican Chairman prohibiting this transfer. But when it got to the big floor it was ignored. We had plenty of testimony and the recommendations we made from all these committees were ignored when this budget got to the big floor. I resent this diversion of road fund money which is already capped off and probably illegal to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

divert this money and again 60 people on your side of the aisle and only 54 over here, never had one thing to do with this budget. And up until now we still didn't until about 2 and 1/2 hours ago. So, therefore, I will be voting 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me just point out for those who just maybe aren't paying attention, that this budget was crafted by the Republican Party, solely by the Republican Party, and behind closed doors. And I would suggest that the short comings and imperfections in the budget are to blame that side of the aisle. We had no input on this budget. We were not asked to participate in this budget and this is not a budget that reflects Democratic priorities but rather those of the Republicans Party, the Majority Party. it's predicated I would argue on a number of broken promises. For those of us who voted for the hospital assessment tax a few years ago, we were promised that, that tax would expire at the end of this fiscal year. does not and we've already seen that we'll be imposing that tax again on hospitals throughout the State of Illinois. And we promised that we would make the Prompt Payment Act work and that it would go into effect on July 1st, but does not. It has now been deferred. And we promised that the nursing home tax would expire at the end of this fiscal year and again, it has not and will not. And we promised a number of years ago that there would be no diversions from the road fund. That, that fund would be capped and the Department of Transportation, would use those money to build roads and to pay for mass transit and not for

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

bureaucracy. But this budget breaks that promise and spends \$15 million and defers it...diverts it to other state agencies, and we have problems when we look at budget in areas of education. It doesn't meet the State Board of Educations recommendation and it doesn't even meet the Governor's campaign promise of 36% funding. It that promise again to the people of the State of Illinois, and it creates a number of losers around the State of Illinois, unfortunately because of that funding. When I look at the print-out that's available from our staff, example, we see that in Representative O'Connor's, district, he'll get less money from the state aide formula Zabrocki, the same way. We see Representative Daniels, will be a winner, congratulations, Mr. Representative Lyons, Representative Zickus, Representative Pankau, Representative Lachner, these will be losers under the state aide formula. Representative Wait, loses money. Representative Spangler, loses money. Representative Ciarlo, loses money. Representative Brady and Ackerman, lose money. Representative Poe and Klingler, will lose money. So, those school districts and those Legislators, will have to tell their people that they lose money under this state aide formula and under this spending plan that's being adopted here today. This has cuts in DCFS of million an agency that's under court order and certainly there's some question in our mind having only had a chance to review this budget for a few hours as to whether or not there's adequate funding in that agency to meet the court orders that we have to comply with. And then there's problems with some of the other parts of the state like our mental health facilities. Fortunately, for the Majority Leader, the "Kiley program" up in the northern part of the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

state that had been slated for closing, will not close.

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, please could I have a little order?"

Speaker Daniels: "Of course you can. Ladies and Gentlemen, of the House, the Gentleman, is correct. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. Just to reiterate, the Kiley Mental Health Center, in the northern part of the state under this proposal will remain open and I congratulate the Majority Leader, for his good work in keeping that facility in his district open. But a facility over in the Decatur area, the Meyer Mental Health Center, will close under this budget and I think the people of Decatur who were promised before the election that, that facility would remain open have been lied to, not only the Governor, but now by this General Assembly. So, again we have a case of another broken promise. For those of you who came here and told your hospitals that you would work to try to bring more money, again I have to point out that a number of Members, will lose money under this proposal. Based on the estimates that we have available. Representative Murphy, will lose \$8.9 Representative Wait, \$1 million, Representative Winters, a million. Representative Mitchell. Śl million, Representative Ciarlo, a million dollars, Springfield, will lose \$10 million for Representative Poe and Klingler, \$3 million in Champaign, for Representative Winkle Johnson, Representative Jones, loses a million dollars and Representative Bost, loses \$4 million. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you think you..."

Speaker Daniels: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir. Okay, thank you."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you believe your a winner under this proposal and you belive that we kept the promises that we made as a state, then I would suggest that you vote 'yes'. But for those of you who feel that we're losers under this program and that we've already broken too many promises to the people of the State of Illinois, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will. And welcome back."

Deuchler: "Thank you. As you know, the Conference of Women Legislators, worked very, very hard for the increase and funding for the domestic violence shelters statewide and I am personally very pleased about that. We had over 800 letters from shelters everywhere in this state describing the conditions in the shelters, saying how much it meant to them that the shelters were there but we know that we've never had the funding so that additional shelters could ask for shelters help and even set-up additional shelters. So, I would like to ask the Sponsor. Do you, is it your intent that the funds designated for domestic violence services be allocated to allow for the increase and expansion of existing programs and the addition of new programs, where feasible for victims of domestic violence?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Deuchler, personally I'm glad that your back and I also want to suggest to you that it's because of efforts led by you that there's an extra million two hundred thousand dollars in that line and the answer to your question is, a resounding 'yes'. Because of your efforts there are funds to do just exactly what you requested. You should be very proud of that, you worked

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

very hard on behalf of yourself and other Legislators, and I'm just delighted that I can be able to answer your question in the affirmative."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Just, I'm very please too. Thank you and thank you,

Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook,
Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I would like to share with you and the audience a little article from the Chicago Sun Times, and it said, "go home early. Legislature, is contemplating going home one month earlier This is great news. than usual. The best thing our legislator could possible do for Illinois, is to go home early and stay there until the next election." I have to say that I agree with that person for the simple reason, to our budgeteer, who we can't find out what is the percentage of state dollars for elementary secondary education. talk about the largest amount of dollars ever, surely that should be because inflation has increased the amount we pay for everything. In 1986, there was a 13% increase in general state aide but that was an election year. In 1994, there was a 4% increase of general state aide, but that too was an election year, This is 1995, it is not an election year and the increase in general state aide is a mere 1.6%, I believe, Representative, that because we increase the dollar amount, if we don't increase the percentage we really have not done very much in reference to increases in education. I also feel that, those changes in the Department of Children and Family Service or Public Aid where the departments may use it's own discretion. Perhaps we're going to find our children are not nearly as

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

served as they could or should be. We asked some questions in reference to people who were getting services because they were receiving SSI. We never received a response to those questions. We wanted to know which services were paid by the federal government at the 100% level and which services were going to be provided by the State of I believe that this budget, regardless to what Illinois? you may say about saving taxpayer money, I believe that the taxpayer's money is being used perhaps against the children. Not for the children but against the children. I have a great deal of concern when we don't put enough money into educating the children in the City of Chicago. There's a deficient of \$150 million and it's not even talked about in this budget. It's not even discussed in this budget. What we said in drafting the School Bill, for Chicago was rather than give you the dollars that you need, we'd rather decrease...decrease the requirements for teachers and your personnel to be certified people. Rather than to add educational dollars from the General Revenue Fund or this common school fund, we said let's don't have a librarian in the schools in the City of Chicago. Instead of a librarian just hire someone to keep the children quiet. Instead of putting money into the Chicago Public School System, what we said was, don't have anybody knowledgeable about food service. Just hire somebody and them serve the children. To heck with nutritional values. We don't care about the calorie count for those kids. Put somebody in there who doesn't know how to preserve food. Instead of funding education for those children in Chicago, what we said was continue to let them go to school in buildings that need repairs, buildings in which the windows need fixing. Buildings in which there are no laboratories

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

for science, we decided that our money would be much better spent helping businessmen who want to get loans from the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, rather than going where the rest of us go for loans, we go to the bank. We go to a bank that's there to loan us money. I say this budget...this budget is mean spirited, Representative. You might not have intended it to be but the children will suffer."

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

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 49 'no', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Ryder, to close."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Today we have had an opportunity that I haven't had in a longtime. That opportunity is to finish our business on time, to finish a budget on time and to leave on time. One of the previous speakers just indicated that...in a newspaper editorial that we should stay home, go home and stay home. Well, let me suggest to you that which we are about to vote on is the business of government in the State of Illinois. It is what finances, it is what appropriates, it spends the dollars that the taxpayers have sent to Springfield, and today we make that decision. In January. in January of this year there was a...some new folks that became the Majority, and as a result, we became responsible for that which we're doing. We accept that responsibility,

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

we've had to learn. We've had to grow, we've had to try to do our best to be that responsibility and to do the job of the people and this is a culmination of that. This is not a budget that I would suggest is going to satisfy everybody because no budget ever does. This is not a budget that I'm going to suggest that meets every need of every person a good idea that they think that's what state government should do, because we don't have enough resources to do what everybody wants us to do. But it is a budget that pays off \$300 million in old debts and it pays it off within the operation of current revenues. It budget that cuts the amount that hospitals have to pay on their assessment and cuts the amount of the tabacco. It is a budget that is our very best effort to meet the needs of the people of the State of Illinois. I'm a lucky guy, I get to be a State Representative, I get to work with a lot of good folks and I want to take one short moment, if I can, Mr. Speaker, I want to take one short moment to thank you, to a lot of folks that have put in a lot of Standing behind me and standing over there are a lot of folks that are very, very tired today because they worked long and hard to help us to do our job. If we good it's either by accident or because they've helped us. Because these are the people that worked long and hard and that's your staff and our staff, appropriations They are the ones that help us and for them and otherwise. for them, I express my gratitude."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 925?' All those in favor signify by saying voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64'aye', 53 'no', none voting 'present' and the House, does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 925 and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 19, Representative Cowlishaw, moves that the House refuse to recede with House Amendment #51, to Senate Bill 19. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it, the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #51, to Senate Bill 19, and the House requests a Conference Committee be appointed. Representative Hoffman, moves to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 47 passed. Representative Parke, moves that lie upon the table. All in favor of the Motion to table signify by saying 'aye', opposed. 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's Motion to table prevails. Mr. Clerk, announcements."

- Clerk McLennand: "Committee announcements. Rules Committee will meet Friday, May 26, at 5:20 p.m., Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee, 5:20, Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Daniels: "We still have a couple of hours of work left, so if the Members will just stand at ease for a few minutes, we'll be back with you. Senate Bill 818. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Order of nonconcurrence."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 818, a Motion to recede from House
  Amendment #1, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 818, I move to recede from House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Meyer, it's been a little hectic around here and when we recede on this Amendment this will be final action. How many Amendments are there, Sir?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Sir, there is just the one."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Meyer, I'm sorry, I could not hear you, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "There is just the one Amendment to the Bill. The only thing that this would allow for is the underlying Bill which, I believe there was no problem with that Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, this is House Amendment #1 and House Amendment #1,

Representative Meyer, was it crucial to the implementation

of your legislation. What, in fact, did it do that, that

you now want to recede?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, Representative, if you will recall that was an Amendment that I was requested to place on the underlying Bill. It had co-sponsorship by both the Republican side and the Democratic side. It dealt with 911 equipment and it dealt with civil law suits for willful and wanton acts again."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Let me make sure I understand this, Representative.

So, you're receding from House Amendment #1. Was House

Amendment #1, that limited the liability for cellular

operators that we discussed in this House previously? Or

does this go to any other expansion of that limited

liability?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "It dealt with the cellular..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, if I remember correctly, Representative. That

Bill was placed on Postponed the first time but on the
second time, we cleared up the confusion over that issue
and I didn't think it was contiguous at that point. Is
there any indication why the Senate did not concur with
House Amendment #1?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "As you recall, the first time it was placed on Postponed and the second time it received 82 votes so, there were still in this House those who felt that there was still a problem with it. The Senate took up the issue, I think it had a fair hearing over there in their debate and the Amendment lost in concurrence in the Senate. The Sponsor at that time, Senator Dillard asked that it be nonconcurred with, which brought it back over to us. In discussing with those that proposed the Amendment, I believe it's in the best interest of this legislation, particularly the underlying Bill, that they continue to work on their idea and over the summer months and in the next Session and possibly can be brought back as another Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, Representative Meyer, we...you're going to try to work on this issue during the course of the summer and bring it back in the Veto Session? At this point then with...receding from...with receding from House Amendment #1 then that will be left with the underlying Bill. Could you please explain to the Body what that underlying Bill will now do, because this will go directly to the Governor."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Yes, Representative. The underlying Bill is...deals with the emergency telephone boards that are required to be put in place when there's a surcharges on...surcharges for equipment on the part of municipalities and counties and it just idemnifies the board as an extension of public agency against a civil law suite unless there is a wanton or willful action."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, Representative, thank you. I think this side of the aisle has no problem. But we were focused on, if there was any contention it was over the Amendment. So, now that that...you requested that be removed from the Bill, I certainly don't see any problem with our side of the aisle...our side of the aisle on receding from House Amendment #1, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rutherford."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman, Representative Meyer, now asks, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 818?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. And this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, will take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 18 'noes', 1 voting 'present'. The House does recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 818. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang."

70th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1995
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was something wrong with my switch, I intended to vote 'present' on that Motion."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman...the Journal will so record.

  Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was momentary off the floor, I would have voted 'yes', had I been present on that."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Journal will so reflect, Representative Hartke. Introductions."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #45, Representative Churchill, Rules Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, would you please let the record reflect that I would have voted 'present' on that last Bill.

  Senate Bill 818."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, the record will so reflect, Representative Flowers. Representative Mitchell. House Bill 1891, on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Mitchell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1891, a Motion to concur has filed and approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell.'
- Mitchell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1891, has been fully debated and left the House with a House vote of 110 to nothing, after a Senate Amendment which we asked for to clarify the language under the obligor in the situation when we have established parentage as to what the...what the state...Attorney Generals Office or the Department of Public Aid can ask for when requesting information regarding wages. There was some problems with not being specific enough and several Members of the House asked me if I would clarify that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

language so that there would be no question about what is provided. We requested that Amendment which Sieben, put on the Bill itself on a voice vote and then went through the Senate 57 to nothing. The Amendment itself changes the language under the Bill that now states that...Amendment the Attorney General Counties Code Public Aid Code. Provides that the information that may be requested from employers and others, include information about salary, wages and other compensation paid and the health insurance coverage provided to a putative father or noncustodial parent by an employer or labor union rather than information about the putative father or noncustodial parent's assets. So, we have clarified that language to make the Bill more specific. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, and would be happy to answer question."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately,

Speaker's Conference Room. Rules, immediately, Speaker's

Conference Room."

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

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Schakowsky: "Representative, I understand the intension of this
Bill is to increase the state's ability to collect child
support from noncustodial parents, mainly from fathers and
I think there isn't anyone here that doesn't applaud that.
Along the way this Bill has been controversial only in the
respect that we didn't want the Department of Public Aid or
the Attorney General, the States Attorneys to be able to go
on fishing expeditions into peoples whole financial

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

records. And I want to express my personal appreciation for your willingness to take into consideration the concerns that were raised. It seems as if some of the remaining concerns that some of us had were addressed in the Senate and I'm wondering if you could tell us how the Senate Amendment narrows the ability to go fishing around in peoples personal records?"

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Ryder in the Chair.

Representative Schakowsky, was that in the form of a question? Certainly. The Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Whiteside, Representative Mitchell, to respond to the question."

Mitchell: "Thank you, Representative. Yes, Sir. The problem that we had was that the putative father, a noncustodial parents assets simply did not state that it had to do with income that was received by that particular employer or labor union, it left it so wide open that some other areas of assets which had nothing to do with that employment would have left it so...so questionable that we were afraid that maybe the employer would have to answer questions or would be forced to answer questions concerning other assets that had nothing to do with his particular job. The Amendment, I think closes that door so that, employer knows that we're speaking only about that compensation that the putative father would receive while in his or her employment."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Have there been any estimates on...I know that Illinois ranks very low in collection of child support.

I'm wondering if there are any estimates on how this new legislation will improve our ability in terms of dollars in collecting child support that is due."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "There's been no estimate, no dollar amount, but I will certainly be very interested in tracking that myself and hopefully by the time this becomes law, maybe in a year from now, if you ask me that question, I'll certainly know because I'm certainly going to keep track of it. This...this has been a big problem in my area, as I know it is throughout the state."

Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Daniels in the Chair. Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker, and to the Bill. Illinois has a long way to go to improve its record in collecting child support. This legislation will enable and put some tools in the hands of the state to gain access information that will lead to improved collections for child support. So, this is certainly a Bill that the Sponsor has worked hard to improve, to meet the concerns of those who raised them. I want to congratulate him and urge an 'aye' vote for...it to concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Mitchell, moves that the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1891. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 109 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1891. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 265, on the Order of Nonconcurrence."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 265, a Motion recede from House

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Amendment #4, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill which was originated in the Senate by Senator García, which calls for report, very extensive reports to be provided by the Public Building Commission in Chicago in relation to projects for...for construction for schools in Chicago. Senator Garcia, has been very displeased by the lack of the performance by the Public Building Commission as well as apparently its lack of accountability. There was Amendment that was brought to me at the very last instance in the committee, and we adopted that Amendment. only...we found later that Senator Garcia, is opposed t.o that because it diminishes the effect of his Bill. should respect Senator Garcia's desires, we should recede from this Amendment and send this Bill to the Governor. I move that we recede from House Amendment #4, to Senate Bill 265 and I'm sorry about the delay."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Dart: "Representative, the...you and I discussed this Amendment when it came over here and it had been something that did, in fact, in certain respect diminished what Senator Garcia's Bill originally did do. Who wanted it...who was the driving force behind having it diminished?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Well, Representative, this Amendment was brought to me by a representative of Mayor Daley's Office. However, after I had an opportunity to talk to Senator Garcia, it

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

turns out that he cleared all of this with Mayor Daley's Office, including his chief of staff months ago when he came originally to bring forward this legislation. I think there was some kind of failure in communication along the way and since this is Senator Garcia's Bill, I think that we should respect his wishes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. I realize time has been short here lately, but have you gotten any indication one way or the other from the city, where they are on this today? Do they acknowledge that there was a communication problem here and that they have since seen the errors of their ways and want? Do the city people down here now want this Amendment off as well and they understand, there was an agreement."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "I think it is apparent that there was, in fact, some communications problem with this and frankly, Representative Dart, at this moment I do not know what the position of Mayor Richard Daley's Office is. I only know the position of Senator Garcia. This is his Bill, we should pass it the way he wants it to be."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just communicating with the Senator about this and he...Representative Cowlishaw, sort of hit the nail on the head with this one. Apparently, there's been some degree of communication problems and it appears as if the city is acknowledged this problem and it seems as if they are in agreement with taking this off. Well, not necessarily but...they seem to understand they made a mistake. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will rise in support of receding on this Amendment and would

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

therefore, support the women's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 265?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 265. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1039. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1037...Senate Bill 10..."

Speaker Daniels: "1039, Mr. Clerk, 1039. Supplemental #1, 1039."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1039, on Supplemental #1, a

Motion...Conference Committee Report #1, has been approved

for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Cross, moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. House...there are none voting 'yes', l16 voting 'no', and the House fails to adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1039 and the Gentleman, Representative Cross, requests a Second Conference Committee Report be adopted...appointed. House Bill 36, Representative Black."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 36, on the Order of Concurrence,

Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1, has been
approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying Bill passed the House 112 to nothing and remains the same. It amends the Juvenile Court Act with respect to minors charged with the manufacture or delivery of cannabis at a school or in a public housing facility. It closes a loophole in the Safe Schools Act. Senate Amendment #1 adds to the Bill. Ιt permits appropriate school officials to inspect and copy a minor's law enforcement records if the school is entered into a reciprocal reporting system with its local law enforcement agency. It also has other protections, that's the body House Bill 115, that I think you also voted on. I would request favorable consideration and ask you to concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 36."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg. Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, this has been a...an Act that we've done a lot of work in lately with expanding the number of offenses and the number of individuals to whom juvenile information can be given to. Who is...who are the appropriate school officials as defined under this Act, that this information can go to?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Representative. Representative Cross is more familiar with this as the underlying language was in one of his House Bills. Would you mind if I refer Representative Cross to answer on the Senate Amendment? Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative Dart, this was formally, the language that you're referring to is identical to House Bill 115 that we

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

did on behalf of the States Attorneys Association. I'll try to answer...what specific questions do you have?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "In the Amendment itself, it talks about appropriate school officials. I was interested in seeing if there's a definition contained in this Act or if there is actual reference made to another Act so that we have a definition of the appropriate school officials, the principal or the janitor or who it may be."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, I think we had this same debate, either from you or Representative Hoffman earlier. There is no definition of the appropriate school official. It's...the language refers to on page 2, line 34, just says refers to the appropriate school official. And that's the only reference to it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "In regards to...on page 3, line 2, it says information transmits to the appropriate school official by local law enforcement. Who are those individuals?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, if you follow on that sentence, it says by local law enforcement agency under a reciprocal reporting system established and maintained between the school district and law enforcement. That's the reciprocal reporting system that we passed about two years ago that each local school district is supposed to have with their law enforcement. So, that...it's referring to that. This Bill doesn't outline who the specific local school official or appropriate school official is."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "So, then is it safe to say then, I think I'm following

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

this now. Is it safe to say that the references made to Section 10-20.14 are the...is the place where you would find...that's the place where you would find the definition of appropriate school officials. in that Section?"

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, announcements."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Report. Representative Churchill,
Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which the following
Joint Action Motions were referred the Resolutions taken on
May 26, 1994, reported the same back 'do approve for
consideration', House Resolution 54. Conference Committee
Report #1 to House Bill 2226. Conference Committee Report
#1 to House Bill 314. Conference Committee Report #1 to
Senate Bill 907 and House Joint Resolution 45."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Tom, the reference that...the 10-20.14 is the reference to the Section we amended a couple of years ago that said, local law enforcement you established with your school district, a reporting system between your two entities. I know in our area we've established that reporting system and it determines who's going to share the information and how. I don't know if everyone else has. I know that we've...I've shared our system with other law enforcement agencies and school districts but that Section 10-20.14 refers to that Section we've talked about in the past."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Dart: "So, is it safe to say then, in this reciprocal reporting system that they're given the ability and the flexibility for them, themselves to determine who is appropriate school officials, we don't give them any guidelines and even though theoretically it could be the janitor, the reality of the situation is that no school district is going to put forward a plan that allows the janitor to get this

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

information. Correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Exactly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Finally, I was looking at House Bill 115 and I think there was reference to the Liquor Control Act as well. Has that been removed from this and if so, was there a reason why?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, I don't remember any reference to the Liquor Control Act in 115. If you can refresh my recollection. I don't see it in..."

Speaker Daniels: "You want to finish your answer, Sir. The Gentleman's time has expired."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Cross to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 36. All those in favor 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 who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 36. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1792. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1792, a Motion to concur with Senate

Amendment #2, has been filed and approved for

consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Zabrocki."

Zabrocki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the Amendment and would ask Representative Durkin, to answer questions concerning that Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Who, Representative Durkin, okay. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, if we could, I would appreciate Representative Durkin, would tell us what this is."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, this is a comprehensive Bill starting with some language which will amend the FOID Act to replace words, has never previously been issued a FOID card with does not currently possess...does not possess the current valid FOID card. We're also amending on this Bill, a Section which will require the Clerk of the Circuit Court to notify the state police of the disposition of the cases concerning minors under 17 years who are arrested for crimes in Section 5, of the Criminal Identification Act. We're also going to be amending the portion of the stalking statue by defining follows and also giving a definition to a bona fide labor dispute is. We're going to change some language in the theft statue based on a recent Supreme Court ruling which..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, so this replaces...the Senate Amendment replaces the entire underlying Bill, So the stuff about thief and all that other stuff, is not on this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Okay. So, this actually becomes the Bill and the changes that were made are fairly substantial. Could you please, tell me about the FOID card provision that will make a Class A misdemeanor?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "It presently is, it has been a Class A misdemeanor to...if you're charged with...under the statue if you found not to have been previously been issued a FOID card it's a Class A misdemeanor. We are changing it, and we're defining it as a 'possessary' offense by deleting the language, has never previously been issued to include the language, does not possess a currently valid FOID card. That is a Class A misdemeanor and we're maintaining it will be a Class A misdemeanor."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, the other provisions in here regarding the stalking, there was some concerns earlier that this could potentially apply a genuine labor strike. That is not your intent at all, is that correct, Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "That's correct."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "This also...this also would cleanup some problems that we had with the fast track criminal legislation regarding the WIC fraud. Is that right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "That is correct. We've added language to make the paragraph...make it more identifiable and easier to define."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "The portion in here, I don't particular have a problem with it, but the portion in this Bill that deals with forceful...if you are charged with a forceful felony and you change your address, that you have to tell the clerk within 24 hours prior to such...such change. Is there any provision here that indicates that these defendants need to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

know about that prior...while they're on bail or while they are on release?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "I believe the language does state that, that there is a duty on behalf of the defendant to...the language states that whenever the defendant changes his address he...there will be a written admonishment to the defendant as to the...that he must comply with the conditions of bail. If he does not comply with those conditions of bail he would be subject to a violation of bail bond or contempt of court."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, to the Bill since I'm running out of time. I think that this legislation, I don't see anything wrong with it. Maybe a few concerns regarding the stalking provisions, although I'm in favor of that, I think that we need to be careful to make sure that we're not stopping legitimate labor strikes and we're not making that felonies with the...just for the legislative intent which was put in the record. I don't see any problem voting for that. In addition, I think that the provision that we didn't get to regarding mandatory supervise release indicating that it would be aggravation in sentencing, is very good. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold. Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Brunsvold."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Brunsvold: "I thought that you'd recognize me to ask questions..."

Speaker Daniels: "I did, but..."

Brunsvold: "...and I was moving from there to here, Mr.

Durk...someone moved the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "I did because I didn't see you in your chair.

Representative Wojcik, can you hold your Motion. All
right, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Brunsvold: "Representative Durkin, I've got some real questions about this FOID card. Last year we did a change in the law and it made a lot of honest people Class IV felon's. What is the state police trying to do here with this FOID card?" Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "It's...what we're doing with this language that...we're quating with the same type of violation if you don't have a valid drivers license. It's not a question of whether or not one has been issued, it's a question of whether or not you have one on your person. What we're stating is, that it's not a defense to say that well, I have it somewhere, it's laying back at home but I have it with me when you had your weapon. We're saying that you have to currently possess a valid FOID card. issue in this case is possession, not a question of whether or not you are validly issued."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "On the first time, first time it said on subsequent...or second subsequent violation of Class IV felony. What's that deal? That's on the bottom part of that paragraph which deals with that Section. On the second violation, if I have an expired card, am I a Class

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

IV felony? Is that what your saying?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Wennlund, in the Chair.

Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "What we're stating is that the second violation for not possessing a currently valid, which would be an expired card. A second violation would be Class IV felony which is the existing law."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "My first violation is a Class A misdemeanor, so if I'm standing here right now and I forget to renew my FOID card, the first time I'm a Class A felon and Class misdemeanor and four years from now if I'm standing here on this floor as a Legislator and I missed my renewal date. I become a felon. Is that what you're saying?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Representative, it's everyones duty to carry a valid FOID card. Those are the laws of the state and we're just stating that, if you're going to carry a firearm that you should and you must carry a valid FOID card. It's something that you should take very serious and everybody else who carries a weapon."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Representative, I understand what you're doing here.

Last year we put that Class IV felony in there and it is ridiculous. I want you to help me take that out of there so people like you and I don't end up felons because we forget to renew our FOID card. Would you commit to helping me do that?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "I'm sorry, but I'm not a gun carrier. But, I believe this is language which was not objected to by the NRA during committee and at this point, I'm prepared to go

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

through with the language as it is."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Let's move on. If there were labor union lockout, would they in any way come under the provisions of this stalking Bill, the stalking language?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Absolutely not."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "They're not included. Could you tell me where in that language it says that?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Sure, under the stalking Sections under Section 12-7.3 subsection (c), where created an exemption to the stalking statue, which states that this Section does not apply to picking occurring at the work place that is otherwise is unlawful, what is other wise lawful, it arises out of a bona fide labor dispute or any exercise of a right to free speech or assembly that is other wise lawful. We've further to define what a labor dispute is by stating that it would be any controversy concerning wages, salaries, hours, working conditions, benefits including health and welfare, sick leave insurance and pension or retirement provisions the making or maintaining of collective bargaining agreements in the terms included in these agreements. That is the language which we have included in this Amendment."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "I know you read that Section there, you come over to
the Section that defines a dispute and under there there's
no definition of lockout and I want to make sure on the
record that a lockout in this situation is not stalking."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Durkin: "First the legislative intent. I'll make that part of the record that lockout would be exempted. Those situations would be exempted from the stalking statue. That's not the intent of this Amendment."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Does this all deal with federal unfair labor practices? Is that also part of this exemption?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "It would be any controversy which there is a situation regarding wages, any type of collective bargaining disagreement as I previously stated. Whether it falls under the...any type of federal collective bargaining disagreement. That can be applied through the statue."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Brunsvold,"

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Representative for that legislative intent."

Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? Representative Hoeft.

Representative Hoeft. Further discussion?"

Hoeft: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative moved the previous question.

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

The 'ayes' have it, the previous question is put.

Representative Durkin to close."

Durkin: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Wennlund: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 1792?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. 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 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Amendment #2, House Bill 1792. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 150."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 150, a Motion to concur with Senate

Amendment #1, has been filed and approved for

consideration."

Speaker Wennlund: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

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

Amendment #1. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Wennlund: "And on that matter is here any discussion?

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My light has been on for about 3 hrs. Is it too late to say anything about the budget?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Yes, it is to late, Representative."

Lang: "Okay."

Speaker Wennlund: "Motor mouth, Representative motor mouth, is that what the <a href="mailto:Tribune">Tribune</a>..."

Lang: "Whatever you want to call me, that's probably the best that you would have called me all Session, Sir."

Speaker Wennlund: "That was the Tribune, that wasn't me."

Lang: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wennlund: "He indicates he will, proceed."

Lang: "Representative, nice tie. Representative, anything about limousines in here. I know Representative Mulligans been looking for a place for that."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, not anything that I know about but I noticed in that article today that at one time you were considering being a Republican. Are you still considering that? You're welcome over here."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lang: "Well, that's just...that's just an open invitation for me to give the speech I was going to give on the budget. I don't think you want to hear that speech. How do the realtors..."

Speaker Wennlund: "That's correct."

Lang: "Feel about this motion to concur, Sir?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, if it's allowable I'd like to defer these questions to Representative Salvi. He handled this portion...the same Amendment on the House when the Bill passed, the Bill passed unanimously. So, if I could defer these question to Representative Salvi."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Salvi, is recognized on the question."

Salvi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This part of the Bill would simply give Lake County the provision simular to that which exist in DuPage County where if a municipality wants to annex a property adjacent to a forest preserve. It has to hop over the forest preserve, the municipality would have to get the permission of the forest preserve to do that."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, how does the Realtors Association feel about this?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "I have not heard from the Relators Association, we passed this in the Bill form, I think it was unanimously a couple of weeks ago."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Were there any people opposed to this in committee either in the House or the Senate?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "No, there were no opponents."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lang: "Anything about abortion in this Amendment, Representative?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "No, I don't believe so, Representative."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Anything about workers' compensation in this Amendment?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "No, nothing about workers' compensation and to anticipate your next question, there's nothing about limousines in this Amendment."

Speaker Wennlund: "That was a safe 'no'. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I just...I don't know how you got the Bill called if there is nothing about abortion or nothing about workers' compensation in here. I don't know what you had to do to get this called but, we're happy you get the opportunity to have it called and I'm unhappy. Would you like me to give the speech that I had on the budget? It's a real good speech."

Speaker Wennlund: "No. Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "I don't know about the rest of the House, Representative Lang, but I want to hear that speech."

Speaker Wennlund: "I'll answer for everyone else, the answer is 'no'. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, crevice to say, Sir, that I'm not going to give it to you now. However, you'll be happy to know that I was going to quote that great American Groucho Marks, during...during my speech. You can come over and hear it later. Thank you, for the answers on the Amendment."

Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Indicates he will."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Hoffman: "Now, the purpose of...the purpose of the Bill, is this for one municipality in your area, Representative?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, are you talking about the Amendment? Are you talking about the underlying Bill that we have already debated?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Hoffman. Please, refine your remarks to the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Well the problem is, Representative, is I think that...you know, since we're voting on final passage, I think we kind of have to address them coterminously. The question is, I can't...I'm not trying to facetious, but I can't recall. I believe that the Realtors Association talked to me about a Bill, now I don't remember if it was this Bill. Do you know..."

Speaker Wennlund: "Proceed. Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, neither in committee nor on the floor was there any opposition from the realtors nor the municipal league, in fact, the municipal league helped me a little bit in committee with it. There was never any opposition to either the undelying...at least to the underlying Bill that I ever have any opposition from anyone down here. Now, with respect to the Amendment that was added on in the Senate, I don't know, I do know that the Amendment that was added on in the Senate at one had been a House Bill that passed out of here unanimously. That's what I've been told. I have never heard of any realtor opposition at any time."

Speaker Wennlund: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental #2 is being distributed."

Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes...yes, Representative. Yes, I think that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Representative Cross has something else to say, if he could."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "I was just handed a fax sheet from the realtors. They
were concerned about Senate Bill 405, Representative. So,
I don't think there is any reference to this."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I think that this could be a good piece of legislation and I don't seen any problem voting 'aye'."

Speaker Wennlund: "No one further seeking recognition, Representative Cross to close."

Cross: "Would appreciate a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Wennlund: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 150?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 150. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 314. On Supplemental Calendar #2, First Conference Committee Report. Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 314 is agreed upon of Conference Committee, it allows juveniles to be housed in local jails, if the juveniles are separated substantially by sight and sound. We've fully debated this Bill on prior occasions. Would be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Wennlund: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Scott."

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

Speaker Wennlund: "He indicates he will."

Scott: "Briefly, Representative Turner. Could you explain what happened here, what have we changed, what have we made better?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott. Representative Turner."

Turner, J." "Yes, Representative. The effective date was changed from January 1, 1996 to January 1, 1997. There was also a portion of the Bill which dealt with the dispositional phase of the Juvenile Court Act, that has been removed. There were two aspects of that, one aspect was that the maximum penalty had been originally increased from 30 to 60 days. That has been removed and deleted and also the ability to house a juvenile after disposition in a local facility, has been removed and deleted."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "Are those changes that you're satisfied with, do you think those are good changes?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "I would have not preferred those changes; however, I know that Senate had two concerns which had been voiced by your side of the aisle. One of those concerns is whether or not federal funding may be lost and so, the Senators though was that, if we waited until January of 1997 perhaps federal regulations could be eased. And the other aspect is this...of this was that they did not want to deal with the dispositional phase and although, I think that, that would have been appropriate, I don't have any problem in concurring with or acquiescing."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "On page 7 of the Conference Committee Report, if you've

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

got it Representative Turner, in Sub-Section 6. It looks like you made...you've made separate requirements for Cook County and then for the rest of the state. Could you explain what the...how Cook County is going to be treated differently from the rest of the state?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "This Bill doesn't apply to Cook County."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "At all?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Correct."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "So, if I understand it correctly now, minor can't be...whose arrested, can't be kept in the same location as...how do they have to be separated from the adult prisoners?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Substantially by sight and sound. We have put a definition in the statute. I'll read it into the record. For purposes of this Section, substantially no contact by sight, sound or otherwise shall mean the absolute least contact by sight and sound obtainable and shall never be more than infrequent, inadvertent and inconsequently visual or auditory contact."

Speaker Wennlund: "Announcements from the Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Attention. Rules Committee will meet,

Speaker's Conference Room, 6:15. Rules, 6:15, Speaker's

Conference Room."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "Well, now are the words...or the phases absolute least contact by sight and sound obtainable and infrequent, inadvertent and inconsequently visual or auditory contact.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Are those defined anywhere?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "No, Representative they are not defined. At some point I believe we just have to rely upon our common sense to determine what the language means. I would agree with you that they...what we've tried to do is use as many adjectives as possible to get the intent of the statute known to those who will be implementing the legislation."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "Well, as long as we're talking about legislative intent,
why don't you tell us what you think infrequent,
inadvertent and inconsequent visual or auditory contact
is."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I think the words speak for themselves but, obviously what we're getting at here is that we don't want any contact that has any affect on the juvenile or the minor and I believe that we described that as basically as essential as we possibly can."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "Well, actually Representative Dart, I think just suggested that it would probably be about the same as the contact the Democrats had with the budget before it...before it passed today. Would that be infrequent, inadvertent and inconsequent visual or auditory contact. It seems like it would fit to me."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "I'm really surprised that you are considering yourselves to be juvenile offenders."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "All right, I was going to be nice but now I can't anymore. Are there...other than that change,

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Representative Turner, is there any other change...why the change in date? Is it just because we think counties can't...can't get this program together. Can't do the necessary separations until 1997, is that why we're pushing it back?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "No, I think the concern there was the federal funding."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "And one final area, Representative Turner. Is there anything in here about Representative Winters' work camp for Winnebago County? Did we manage to get this in here anywhere?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I think you know, that is not in the Bill."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Scott, please bring your remarks to a close."

Scott: "I have nothing further. Thank you, Representative Turner for your answers."

Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Indicates he will."

Hartke: "Representative Turner, earlier this spring Representative Noland and I had an opportunity to meet with some truant officers and school officials in Effingham County. They were concerned, we also have a couple of judges, states attorney's up there, about the inability to hold a juvenile for more than 6 hours. Are you familiar with that portion of the law?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, A.: "I am familiar with that requirement in the existing statute and this Bill does address that."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Excuse me, did you say this Bill does not address that?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Representative, this Bill does address that concern."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "What time frame does that expand that to?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "What the Bill says, Representative, is that the juvenile can be housed in the local facility if they are separated substantially by sight and sound and it doesn't have a 6 hour requirement. However, it there is a 36 hour requirement in other parts of the statute. If the juvenile however, cannot be separated substantially by sight and sound then the 6 hours would apply."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "So, we've addressed a couple of issues then. Not only the 6 hours by making local facilities capable without requiring new facilities to be built in those locations. Thank you very much, Representative. To the Bill. I think this is a very good major move in deterring what our local officials perceive as a, you can't do anything with me, attitude by many youths. That's why I have gone on as a Sponsor on this Bill because it did address this issue. I wanted to make that perfectly clear. I want to commend Representative Turner, Representative Myers and Skinner and Black, for all the work they did on this piece of legislation and sincerely hope that the Governor signs this piece of legislation and I support the First Conference

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Committee Report."

Speaker Wennlund: "The Gentleman...further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In ten years here I have never gotten up and asked anybody for a vote nor begged anybody for a vote on this floor. I've presented Bills, some have passed, have failed. But I'm going to ask you, and if I have to I'll beg. I want this Bill passed. This Bill means as much to me as anything I've done on this floor, simply because it's the product...of a very good friend of mine. Who spent most of his adult life as a probation officer in Vermilion County. He took his life two weeks ago and he realized that when the federal...when the federal mandate went into effect many counties wouldn't be able to comply He was really a fantastic guy who cared about it. kids who were in the probation and juvenile system. didn't think it was fair that we had to take them all over the State of Illinois, hundreds of miles away their...their significant adult parent or quardian, away from their attorney. Just because the federal law changed and we couldn't, we could no longer house them in a facility that cost the taxpayers of Vermilion County almost \$20 million. But after the '79, after it was built in the '89 federal mandate change we couldn't hold them there and I know they're many of you in that same position that jails and your taxpayers have spent million of dollars on, and the '89 mandate said we can't hold them there. If knew Jerry Christman, and Jay Hoffman did, he wasn't going to do anything or support anything to put any juvenile in danger or any juvenile in jeopardy. He just worked very hard and said, this doesn't make any sense. You are not

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

doing the juvenile any good by hauling them all around the state; putting \$16 million a year in to 16 regional centers. We don't have any in my area at all. All because the federal government says, if you don't do this we're going to take \$2 and 1/2 million away from you. I promised his widow we'd put this on the Governor's desk and I like the effective date, I wish it was effective when the Governor signed it. But this was a good and decent man who I think burned out trying deal with juvenile problems, cause the last time we talked he said. I can't save any of them anymore and I use to be able to save three or four. And he said, I don't know what's happening, Bill, and I don't know where we went wrong and I don't know what we have to do to the Juvenile Court Act. But, I'm begging you and I'm asking you for this vote and I want it on the Governor's desk, not so much for me but for a guy who spent 30 years in the probation system and he was a damn friend and he wouldn't do anything to endanger juveniles. I ask for an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Turner to close."

Turner, J.: "Please pass this Bill."

Speaker Wennlund: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopted the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 314?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 314. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar 2.

70th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1995
- Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 907. Representative Kubik. Excuse me, Representative Lang, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Lang: "Thank you. I see it on the Supplemental, Sir, but I do not believe its been printed and distributed. Could we have the Clerk check that?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Mr. Clerk. Take it out of the record.

  Representative Lang, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Lang: "Thank you. I rise on a brief point of order. I think you'll all be interested in it. I just open..."
- Speaker Wennlund: "State your point."
- Lang: "...a fortune cookie and I found a fiscal note. I just wanted you to be aware of that."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Parke, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Parke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would inquire, did it have a agency letterhead and was it signed?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I could barely make out the signature. It looked like Wetstone, but I'm not exactly sure, there was no letterhead, it did look fake but, how many do you find in a fortune cookie, you know?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Thank you, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 907. On the Order of Concurrence, on the Regular Calendar on page 4. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1825."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1825, a Motion to concur with Senate

  Amendment #1, has been filed and approved for
  consideration."
- Speaker Wennlund: "The Chair recognizes Representative Moore, Andrea Moore."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1825. Senate Amendment #1, provides that no individual throughout the election day and before the closing of the polls may check any vote totals for any candidate or initiative on the automatic voting equipment. You will recall that House Bill 1825 was the Optical scanning Bill that, I believe was...if it wasn't unanimous it was very nearly unanimously supported by the House and sent over to the Senate. In addition the automatic equipment must be programed so that no individual may reset the equipment for refeeding of ballots unless the code was provided from the election authority. It amends the procedures for retabulation as set forth in the Bill as passed by the House. The Amendment states that retabulation procedure shall apply both to...prior to and after the proclamation is completed. However, after the proclamation of results, the election authority must obtain a court order to unseal voted ballots except for election contests and discovery recounts. It also changes the effective date of the Bill. I would ask that we support this concurrence and be happy to answer any question."

Speaker Wennlund: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?" Speaker Wennlund: "She indicates she will."

Granberg: "Representative, part of the initiative of this was to make it easier to check voting credentials. So, for now I vote, and I submit my voter card and put it in the machine afterwards and the machine detects some problem. Will it reject it and send back to me and I would revote? How would this work?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Andrea Moore."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- Moore, A.: "Actually that issue was discussed in the main part of...that's not the Amendment."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Well, if you could Representative, this is final passage so this will be our last opportunity to address this issue."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Andrea Moore."
- Moore, A.: "If...yes, if there is something that is out of order and the ballot is rejected, you will have an opportunity to revote."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Well, so that will happen. The machine will reject it and give back to you and then you would have to ask for another ballot?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."
- Moore, A.: "Just as now, if you make an error in voting and you spoil your ballot, you can get another ballot."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "I think currently you would notice yourself if the ballot was spoiled. The machine does not tell you. So, under your proposal the machine, you would have to submit the ballot...submit the ballot to the machine and then it would make the determination whether it was spoiled or not. So, there is a difference between current practice, isn't there?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."
- Moore, A.: "Well, yes. There's the...there's the element of the machine verse the human element of noticing that you have done something incorrect."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "What would be the difference then with absentee ballots? I assume if I request an absentee ballot and I

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

vote by absentee, then that...the same set of circumstances would no longer exist."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."

Moore, A.: "Again, that's part of the original Bill that passed both Houses practically unanimously and we are on the Amendment. All the Amendment does is to make the security portion of the Bill more stringent and to change the effective date."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, I understand but I mean, this is final passage and we're probably going to vote for it the way it stands now so, there's no need to create an issue about not answering questions, I don't think. But I think the Bill also allows Representative, for a county clerk to redraw precinct lines. Isn't that correct?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."

Moore, A.: "No, Representative Lang, this is not about leaf burning. I do not think that there's any additional language in this Bill other than what is in the current statue regarding precinct boundaries."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "Not to my knowledge, no."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg. Representative Moore. Representative Granberg, please proceed. Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, it's indicated to me that the Bill provides that the number of registered voters in each precinct, using this optical scan system may not exceed

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

800. So, if it does exceed 800 then the election jurisdiction can actually change the make-up of the precinct. You were not aware that was in your Bill?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "The purpose on the intend of the Bill has been to mirror the existing statue as far as the election authorities duties and obligations. But only to add this as an optional and available resource for counting."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, on page 10, line 1 through 6, indicates when а precinct tabulation optical scan technology electronic voting system is used the county or board of election commissioners may existing boundaries or may consolidate, combine. alter. decrease or enlarge the boundaries of the precinct. That seems...that seems to be a great deal of discretion afforded local election officials where they can change precincts, change the precincts of different State Representatives, change the precincts and the components of different senatorial districts. That to me is a very, very major policy change in what we have done in the past. So, I would now allow an election official, a local election official to change my precincts and change my precincts and put it into somebody elses district. Now, we drew these precincts in reapportionment but now we're going to let the locals decide how to change those Representative districts, those Legislative Districts."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."

Moore, A.: "The language that you're reading does not change the existing authority. It does not address reapportionment, it is the end...it allows changes in precincts as the current...as the current Election Code does provide for.

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- It does not...it does not provide for reapportionment during non reapportionment years."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Granberg, please bring your remarks to a close. I gave you an extra minute and you've gone beyond that."
- Granberg: "Well, Representative, you indicated they had this current authority to do this same thing. How can they have the current...the current authority to do this when we have not yet initiate optical scan of procedure?"
- Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Moore."
- Moore, A.: "The authority that you're talking about, that I am answering to, has to do with boundary changes for precincts. And that's the authority for the local election authority currently and that's all we're referencing. This is a counting mechanism."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ronen."
- Ronen: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this...of this Amendment. The...basic Bill is one that we all discussed at length in Elections and State Government and on this Floor it's a sound policy, it's permissive language that allows counties to take advantage of new technology and this Amendment really strengthens the Bill by insuring that no...no problems will occur during the course of election. So, I would urge all my colleagues on this side of the aisle and others to vote 'yes' on this Bill."
- Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Wennlund: "The Lady has moved the previous question be

70th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1995
- put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have and Representative Moore is recognized to close."
- Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we support

  Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1825 and concur with in
  that Amendment."
- Speaker Wennlund: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1825?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 1825. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 868."
- Clerk Rossi: 'House Bill 868, a Motion to concur with Senate

  Amendment #1, has been filed and approved for
  consideration."
- Speaker Wennlund: "The Chair recognizes the Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to concur with Senate

  Amendment #1, on House Bill 868."
- Speaker Wennlund: "And on that question, is there any discussion?

  The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

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

Speaker Wennlund: "She will."

Schakowsky: "What does it do?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Senate Amendment #1, provides that any individual or

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

entity, whether for-profit or non-for-profit, that provides the relevant services is eligible for consideration to participate in programs funded or administered by the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. the Department of Mental Health Disabilities and the the Department of Children and Family Services. This would only not apply when federal funds and the federal government required that the funds be used for not-for-profit. But this is consistent with the practice that happens in other state departments now, such as Public Aid and it would assure that the services were based on the high quality of services."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "What kind of for-profit businesses are we talking about? Can you give an example of a for-profit that might want a contract with DASA?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Chicago Osteopathic Hospital is a not-for-profit entity right now. It does administer programs for the agencies that we just spoke about. It does a very good job, the agencies would like to keep contracting with Chicago Osteopatic but it is in the process of being bought out for...by a for-profit entity right now and so it will become for-profit rather than non-for-profit. But this would ensure that the services would be based on who is doing a good job and not on the entities tax status."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "So, this Legislation...so, this Legislation was brought mainly by Osteopatic Hospital. I noticed there is a number of other Bills where the same provision is in it, and I am wondering, is this primary a move by Osteopatic Hospitals to be eligible to compete for these contracts?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wennlund: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please give your attention to the speaker's. Just a few more hours and we'll be out of here. Just a few more hours. Please, give you attention to the speaker so we can get the business of the House completed. Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Well, it is not specifically for that entity but, yes, it would address their problem that they are doing now.

It's not that they are asking for a new program but they have done a program from DASA for...I'm sorry, for Mental Health, for quite some time and so this would insure and allow the provider who is providing good services, to be able to continue to give those services."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if there's anything that you can do about people on my side of the aisle trying to distract me with extraneous materials."

Speaker Wennlund: "Will the people on the Democratic side of the aisle, please give Representative Schakowsky, your kind attention please, as opposed to the distract? Thank you, she will appreciate it."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, I do appreciate that. So, other than this provision dealing with for-profits, does this Amendment change the underlying Bill in anyway?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "No, it does not."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you. To the Amendment. I would urge support of this Amendment and would like a concurrence vote."

Speaker Wennlund: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Wennlund: "She'd be glad to."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Holbrook: "Representative Lindner, recently in the City Belleville, we had a large corporation come in from Phoenix and tell us that they were going to open a string of group homes for problem children and our...local DCFS regional manager came in and told them they could not operate in our because they were not-for-profit. Our school board. our city, of course you know, under the group home situation now with the supreme court ruling, we cannot deny a group home just because it's a group home. Regardless of its financial impact on our school district. We tried to amend and I placed an Amendment in on the education appropriation budget because, my school district Belleville is already on the financial watch list. We cannot stop this group home from going in and the not-for-profit groups work with our community and work them to where they are not a financial burden on our school districts. Since my Amendment did not make it out rules, and the Education Appropriation Committee, if this rule is passed here the way that I hear you explaining it on the Senate Amendment. A for-profit group can go in business, in my hometown, open their string of group homes and by the way they are from Phoenix and my school district could very well go into bankruptcy from what I'm hearing. I've tried to address this problem by putting it in under the orphanage fund for funding for our schools. non-for-profit groups in my community work with us on these situations. This not-for-profit group out of Phoenix has told us they will do anything they want and they'll make a buck at it. Now, am I reading something wrong on this Would this allow them to go into business and DCFS contract with them?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lindner: "No, I don't think this would be applicable to your situation, Representative, because this Amendment would only allow that the for-profits are eligible for consideration also. So, it doesn't mean that the contracts would go to them, it would just allow them to eligible for the consideration."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Right now, they're going to be in competition with our local United Way and Catholic Charities Homes and they're saying, they have the capacity and the Catholic Charities and the United Ways say, they don't at this time. They are willing to work with our community and build upon it. And they way I read this, if there's a need then they would be considered or they could be put in business and end up putting my school district from the watch list into bankruptcy."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "This Bill would only address that the entity that could provide the services that any of the state agencies contracted with, that any entity that could provide the best services for the least amount of money, which I would think that...those are the services that the agency would want and that you would want for your community and for your people and that's what this entity would allow."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "But, under this Amendment DCFS could contract with these people, open these group homes. By the way, they have already invested nearly a quarter of a million dollars in our community, even when we told them not to. To wait until this process went through and apply for a 501(c)3, and they laughed at us and told us they were going to be put under contract and they knew it."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Well, DCFS, yes, they would be eligible for consideration but DCFS wouldn't have to contract with them.

And I assume that, you know, you would keep watch over this and have some input into that situation. If you felt that there was something that was trying to put your non-profit out of business. But this does not necessary mean that any for-profit who comes in is going to get the contract."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Representative, I understood that this merely was only going to apply to mental health up in the Chicago area and I just can't understand why we expanded this. I could see where this could go into any community and literally, especially in a small school district, bankrupt them just for a for-profit company to make money off housing students or handling a mental health institution of some sort out of the private sector. Would you be willing to take this back and have it apply only to the case that you have...I understand that this Legislation originated for?"

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "No, I would not be willing to take it back. I really don't understand your reasoning, I don't think it's going to bankrupt anybodies school district. It's just going to assure that your community gets the best services for the best price. And that there is a choice by the state agencies as to who to consider to provide those services."

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

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Wennlund: "Representative Parke, moves the previous question be put. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All those in favor signify by saying

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

'aye'; all those opposed signify by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the previous question is put. Representative Lindner is recognized to close."

- Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge that you pass this Bill, the underlying Bill allows DCFS to do a study to see if secure care facilities can be built in this state. We are spending millions sending our children out of state because we do not have secured care facilities here and I would urge passage of this Amendment."
- Speaker Wennlund: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 868?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 67 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 868. And this Bill, having received a required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 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 Motion were referred, action taken on May 26, 1995, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 2403 and Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 1279."
- Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Daniels in the Chair. Supplemental Calendar #2, House Bill 2226. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2226, Conference Committee Report #1, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Biggert."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I would move adoption of the First Conference Committee and would ask that Representative Ryder speak."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, that we have adopted the Budget Implementation Act that sunsets the hospital provider assessment. This will bring in the long term care and 'DD' homes and assessment to the same sunset date which is in two years and I move its adoption. Be glad answer any question."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Currie: "Representative, this does two thing. It imposes the assessment on facilities for the developmentally disabled.

Is that right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we've already done that. This sunsets it
 in two years."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "So, both the tax...the tax on the facilities for the developmentally disabled and the tax, \$1.50 per bed in long term care, both of those were included in 465. The problem is, that there was not a sunset on either one of them. Is that right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it's not that, that's a problem. It's now that we're bring these into compliance. It's...until we pass the other one we can't deal with this one. So, that it makes these assessment the same the hospital provider assessment."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Well, on page 158 in 465. I did see the long term care provider \$1.50 a day bed tax. Is that different, the language is different because that language did not include a sunset, that was an 'importunity' tax but, is that different then from what you're doing here? I mean, you would agree that you've already adopted the \$1.50 a day bed tax in 465, right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I agree with what we did. I don't characterize it as a tax, I do characterize it as an assessment which is the words that you and I used when we passed it in the first place. But, I clearly we've done it and we're simply sunsetting it now in two years. I would assume that you would want to join with me given the character of your remarks during the earlier debate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Well, to the Bill, Speaker and Members of the House. This certainly is part of your Budget Implementation Plan but this at leases give those of you who voted on...voted for 465, the opportunity to do what you thought you were doing on that vote. And that is the opportunity to make another commitment, but it's only a two year tax. It's not a tax for ever and ever. Yes, indeed, we'll get rid of it two years from now. Will that, Speaker and Members of the House. That was exactly the commitment that we made Its a limited tax, it won't last forever and years ago. somehow you failed to do it in 465, you actually voted a tax that was forever. Maybe you ought to ignore the opportunity to put on the two year limit because chances are good, Speaker and Members of this House, changes are good you'll be right back. Right back

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

years time having to extend yet one more time. Having to revote one more time another tax on these provider groups. So, you know what the measure is. You know that you've already voted to extend these taxes ad infinitum, this is your opportunity to say, no, no, I only meant to do it for two years and just remember when you make that commitment that you will probable back in two years time breaking it one more time for the people of this state."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder to close."

- Ryder: "Okay, Representative. And to the previous speaker, here's your choice. You can vote in favor this Bill and limit an assessment to two years. You can vote in favor of the Bill that limits the assessments to two years. Or you can vote against it, which means your in favor of having the assessment go on forever. That's your choice. I'm voting 'yes', cause I'm voting to limit the assessment for two years and I would ask you all to join me. We'll see what the folks on the other side of the aisle want to do."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2226. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 82 'aye', 31 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 2226. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Corrected Committee Report. Corrected Report for the Rules meeting. Reported back, 'do approve for consideration' House Bill 1279, Conference Committee Report

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

#1."

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2403. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Supplemental #3. Got to take the Bill out of the record,

the computer isn't ready on the system yet. We'll get

right back to it. (Senate Bill) 365. Senate Bill 365.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 365, a Motion to recede has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just ask to recede from the House Amendments on Senate Bill 365. Those have been put on another Bill. I would request an 'aye' on this...on this Motion, 365, I would like to go to the Governor clean."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative, we're going to change definition from handicapped to disabled. Is that the intent of Senate Amendment #3?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Representative Granberg, we're taking those Amendments off of this Bill, completely and sending it to the Governor without the Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "The question is why, Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Those Bills we passed out of here yesterday on Representative Winters Bill. Why, I don't know. But all

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

three of those Bills went on another Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, you're not sure why you're moving to recede from
House Amendment #3?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Yes, Sir. I'm sure why I want to recede because we've already passed those...Senate Amendment #3, had three Bills on them, 164, 165, and 292 and all of those Bills when on Representative Winters Bill. I can't remember the name of it. But they've already passed out of this chamber."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, we no longer need this provision. Is that what you've indicated, that it's on Representative Winters Bill which has passed both Bodies."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Yes, Sir. And that Bill number was 2076."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell. Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, if that was on Representative Winters Bill, I guess that's fine. What about the other provision though that provides that the State Board of Education shall require annually an appropriation from the command school fund for region office education expenses?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "That too, is in that Amendment. That is also left.

The only thing left on here is 365, which changes the GED assessment test to 17 years of age rather than 18 years."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, I think, Representative when we adopted Senate Amendment...I'm sorry, when we were dealing with this issue, it seems like a pretty good idea. So, why would we not want to do this in regard to the State Board of

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Education. Is that too, on another Bill some place?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And what is the status of that Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "I believe its left this chamber. I'm not positive of that, I remember speaking on that Amendment just yesterday afternoon."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, Representative Mitchell, if you're not positive would it not be better to include this provision because it does seem like a very good idea that they would be required to send those funds to our educational service regions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Representative, I am sure that, that has passed out of this chamber. I just checked with the Sponsor of 2076, and we did pass that out."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, can you have Representative Winters indicate where his Legislation is. Did it pass both chambers? Is it on its way to the Governor or did it just pass this chamber. What is the status of that Legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Yes, I've checked with Representative Winters, and that Bill did pass out of this House as an Amendment to 2076, which I believe is on the way to the Governor."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Winters, if you could indicate to me, so the language contained in this Amendment, House Amendment #3, is currently on your Legislation on another

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Bill that you are sponsoring. It has passed the House, that has passed the Senate and, in fact, it is on the way to the Governor for signature."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Yes, Representative Winters, I'm going to state that that Bill has passed both chambers and is on the way to the Governors desk and if that true, would you please wave?

Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, thank you, Representative Winter, Representative Mitchell. The team of Mitchell and Winters, Winters and Mitchell. It really was...I think this is a good idea, so I appreciate it and I would certainly concur with Representative Mitchell to recede from House Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 365. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does recede from House Amendment #3, to Senate Bill 365. And this Bill having received the require Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2403. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." Clerk McLennand: "Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2403 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an issue we're very familiar with. We've debated this at great length. This Bill says, that while there certainly is a right to an abortion all nine months of pregnancy, the taxpayers will

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

not pick up the tab for the abortion except in the cases of life of mother. And we added in response to concerns of many legislate...Legislators additional exception of rape and incest abortions. The history of this Bill is very simple. Many of you expressed concern during the debate on what was Senate Bill 662, that we would jeopardize our federal funding if we didn't have in this Bill that said that we would comply with the federal rules that requires states to pay for rape and incest abortions. have, in response to those concerns, added that language and now the Bill very simply says that we prohibit taxpayers funded abortions except in the case of the life of the mother, rape and incest. I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Granberg: "Have the...has this Conference Committee Report been on the Member's desk for the requisite hour?"

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2403 has been on the desk since approximately 8:30 this morning."

Speaker Daniels: "The answer is yes. Representative Granberg, further questions?"

Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, our indulgence we have not seen...seen these. They're starting to come through awfully quickly and some of these Conference Committees are becoming very, very size able, so to speak. We've completed the business of this House by doing the budgets and we're just trying to be cautious in that we don't do a lot of legislation that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

we haven't had a chance to adequately review for all the Members, not just our side of the aisle. So, we just want to make sure that the rules are being followed, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Absolutely, Sir and that's why since they've been there since 8:30 in the morning, we wanted to make sure you had enough time to review it. Further discussion?

The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise strong opposition to House Bill 2403. We've already taken a vote on a measure that essentially identical. The failed. I think that there might be other issues that other Sponsors might like to have a crack at before returning to this. This is bad public policy. Right now we are under an order from the feds that if we want...if we want our Medicaid...public aid program to earn federal financial participation, we must provide abortions to women on our Medicaid roles under certain circumstances. Bill comes to us with a clearly unconstitutional provision. one that says, that in instances of sexual assault, instances of incest report, reports must be made to appropriate authorities. I have a...a lawsuit already been through the courts, Doe vs. Wright, and in Doe vs. Wright the court knocked down this very requirement, as passed by the State of Pennsylvania, saying it is never the inarguably clear that imposing additional limitations on a federal funding program is not a permissible vehicle achieving this law enforcement vehicle. Same kinds of reporting and certification requirements set forth in Pennsylvania statute and in this Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2403 had appeared in earlier versions of the Hyde Amendment but they have been removed. not part of federal law. So if we take the federal law and

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the federal money that comes with that law, we clearly will be out of compliance if we adopt this Conference Committee Now it's my guess that the Sponsor knows that. It's my guess that what the Sponsor wants to do is to take the case to court. The Sponsor is willing to risk federal financial participation in the Illinois Medicaid program so he can take the taxpavers to court to duke it out in that chamber rather than this and rather in...than in the federal Congress. I think we do far too much legislating by Federal Court decree here in Illinois. We're under Federal Court decrees in our Departments of Children Family Services, Mental Health, Rehabilitation Services and now we'll decide we want to be under Federal Court decrees in the Department of Public Aid as well. How much will it When will it end? Skip the whole thing, save the taxpayers a pile of money, let's deal with this issue as we should though the federal government and through our own responsible state legislation. Vote 'no' on this Conference Committee Report. And I would like verification should this achieve the necessary numbers."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to tell everybody who's listening that in the real world I have sent out a survey in my Legislative District asking them this question. The response in my district, which I do not believe is unique in your districts, is that they overwhelming say that taxpayer's money should not be used in having people on welfare to have abortions. I believe that this Bill is a strong signal that the people of State of Illinois want to send. I believe it is the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

right thing and I would ask this Body to support this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Ronen."

Ronen: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Representative Parke talked about a legislative survey he sent out. If he were to send out a survey about this Bill the question he should ask is, should we break the federal law? And if people said yes we should, then you should vote for this Bill because this Bill is a violation, still, of federal law. We've debated this issue before and this House resoundingly defeated that notion. It's kind of ironic that the Session is going to end on this issue. A Session that has seen mean spirited attacks on poor people, inattention to concerns of women all across the state. And here in this Bill we have a combination of both those things. Let's get together and let's see how we can really harm poor women. That's what this Bill is all about. denying them benefits that women of means have already. I would remind this Body that federal law requires that Medicaid funding be used to reimburse abortions for women who are victims of rape and incest. This Bill would deny that by the reporting requirement. I urge all of my colleagues to think very carefully about what you're doing. Whether you're pro-choice or anti-choice, this Bill is a violation of federal law and is especially mean spirited towards poor women in this state. I urge all of my colleagues to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to bring to the attention of the Members of the General Assembly an article

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

that was in the (State Journal Register) in February, 1995. It was an interview of the Chief of Obstetrics Gynecology at S.I.U. School οf Medicine Springfield. In this article the head of the obstetrics department talked about the problems that arise in medicine from the misuse or overbroad or emotional use of the term abortion. And I'm quoting the physician, '99% of pregnancy terminations have nothing to do with abortion on demand and that 20% of all pregnancies end in abortion'. The physician then went on to give examples that many of us might not think when we think of terms of ending abortion. Missed abortion, which is a dead fetus retained in uterus. A threatened abortion, a bleeding live fetus threatening to abort. An inevitable abortion, a dead fetus being expelled, also known as imminent abortion. Αn incomplete abortion, a partial expulsion of fetus. Α complete abortion, a spontaneous abortion also known as a miscarriage.' And the article went on to indicate that perhaps the term abortion is even inappropriate to these types of situations during a pregnancy. I think it's very dangerous if we're trying in a medical plan for poor women to indicate exactly what kind of procedures can or cannot be used. I don't think that we have that expertise. would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise to again oppose House Bill 2403. I'd like to first thank Representative Klingler for her, I think, very pointed comments that put this issue into the proper perspective. We are talking about a medical procedure that is available to women legally in the State of Illinois and in the United States. We are talking

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

about a medical procedure that is available to women can't afford it. That helps to preserve the life, the health and the safety, as Representative Klingler pointed out, to women. Now let me suggest again and plead, I may, to my colleagues that why we grapple with a burgeoning child welfare system in this state with children that are born victims of AIDS, victims of crack cocaine. The day they are born they are victims of a system that forces an unintended pregnancy on women who like women of all economic classes may be involved in a situation where there is an unintended pregnancy. And yet as a matter of public policy by voting for this Bill we are saying, if you do not have the ready cash available, we are asking you to live with this unintended pregnancy. But if you have the you don't have to. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in case you haven't figured it out, let me connect the dot points in this picture for you. The multi-million and billion dollar DCFS budget, let's connect the dots. okay? Let's draw this picture. Where are the victims of abuse coming from, where are the victims, the child, infants born with, addicted to cocaine? They're unintended pregnancies that we force women to come to full term. Now I ask you to please connect the dot points here, let's draw the picture of a healthy life for children and for women in this state. Please vote 'no'. And I would ask for I would like...the last 35 seconds to read verification. the fiscal note. Which frankly I don't have my glasses on so I can't read it. Failure to comply with the federal mandate jeopardizes our obtaining matching federal funds. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan." Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

House. I also rise in strong opposition to this Bill. this Bill is passed it will be the fourth Federal Court suit in one year about this matter. Now for someone that's fiscally conservative I don't think we want to spend the state's money, once again, on a fourth suit. This is second attempt to pass this. The last time rape and incest was left out and now it's included but only if you report it. What victim of incest reports it? By the time some of these young children are pregnant or are obviously pregnant because they don't know they are pregnant, it is much too be of real help. We've had abortions as young as nine years old with victims of incest. For years its known fact that people who want to make decisions like this, if they have money, can make them. And I would ask this House to think carefully. If you have a situation you may think you know how you would deal with it but when the time came, do you really know how you would It's very elitist for someone who has the money deal it? that could say I'll deal with it however when the To deny that option to someone that is poor. comes. Why do we constantly have an assault on poor women? Why is it young children who may be victims of rape and incest should be left alone and denied this option because know enough to report? Why should we be denied federal funding because we cannot comply? Is it because we hope the federal law will change and the Constitution will rule? This is an assault on women and don't forget that and think about it. Do we know evervdav of our life when we make a decision or when we look forward make a law, how it will affect us when the time actually comes for you to make that decision? Don't the option of a personal and private decision with a family

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

and a doctor to a woman just because she is poor. Vote 'no' for this Bill, it's a bad Bill, we shouldn't even be seeing it again."

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

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. We learn a valuable lesson in the Old Testament, in the Book of Genesis, about the consequences of taking more than one bite of the apple. Not only are we jeopardizing the shaky underpinnings of the state's financing, whether it can stand or fall under the weight of having its Medicaid budget challenged by a clearly unconstitutional act. Not only can we not afford such a legal challenge but I tell you as the Minority Spokesman for the General Service Appropriations Committee that when the Attorney General, Mr. Ryan, came before our committee and Representative Krause, who was present in this committee, can attest to it as can the Chairman, That when I asked the Attorney General if there Biggins. would be anymore resources, anymore of the state's resources, utilized through his budget in order to pursue this feudal legal challenge, his answer was that the matter had reached its conclusion. The political ramifications I think of this issue are equally grave. Because it really capsizes the issue that faces the Majority Party. indeed the Majority Party wishes to stay in the majority. Those of us...those of us who watch politics, those of who observe politics see the internal contradictions, the internal tensions that the Majority Party faces in trying to...in trying to put forward a public image over whether or not they are pushing the envelope to far. Here with this second bite at the apple not learning the lessons of

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

history we see the envelope is indeed being pushed too far. And indeed whether a woman lives in Willow Brook Wilmette or the West side of Chicago, a woman who faces the tragic circumstances who would count on this as if she could count on nothing else in her life to affect the future of her life. Here we have because of...because of the unnecessary greed to have a second bite at this apple. that woman would have her life irreparably damaged. There's no reason, there's absolutely no reason. whv we have to confront this issue again in this Assembly. Unless...I won't even speculate as to perhaps why we are considering this. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in private conversations with many of my colleagues. on both sides of the aisle, with many of my colleagues who vary in their degree of support on the issue of a woman's right to choice, whether they support it or whether they don't. I respect their opinion no matter what. don't know that there's overwhelming sentiment in this chamber to see this vote again. But if we must someone a second bite of the apple, we learn in the Old Testament what happened before, it'll happen again. vou."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady or the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "To try to elude to the Old Testament in defense of a 'no' vote for this Bill is the height of irony.

We...that's almost unbelievable. The November elections spoke loud and clear to all of us and the voters where simple, they just said, they simply said, the voters where not simple not in my district. The voters simply said, listen to us just listen to us and do our bidding. And they said clearly, in every precinct in Illinois, that no

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

matter what they felt about abortion they didn't think that the government should pay for them. In the exception of rape and incest they can agree. It's ironic, isn't it. that the price of an abortion. I'm not sure how many hundreds of dollars it is. But if the abortionist feel so strongly that the poor should have them, why don't they them for free? Has anyone ever wondered why they, how much money they make? Why don't they at least cut their profit margin out? This Bill would remove an insult to the The Lady who spoke earlier said, well only the...only those born into the wealthy families those won't have been born with challenges that she would rather see the baby die for, than face that challenge. she basically expressed the idea that, well if they're not going to be born with a silver spoon in their mouth goodness sakes let's not let them be born. It doesn't matter if you're pro-life or pro-choice, this issue is about doing the right thing. And if you want those women to have abortions tell the abortionist. Just do it and don't charge and then you've had your way. An 'aye' vote is right."

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

Kaszak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I been an attorney now for over about 15 years and I have reviewed this Bill and carefully gone over every single provision in this Bill. And you know I was lead to believe that this has something to do with worker's compensation. I cannot find one provision in here that refers to worker's compensation. But what I can find is many provisions that deal with the integrity of a woman and the right of a woman and the protection of the health and care of that woman. And that's why I'm going to vote in favor of this Bill."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Murphy."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Murphy, M.: "Representative Salvi, does this Bill in anyway regulate the abortion clinics in Illinois in order that we may ascertain how many late trimester abortions there are or at what cost the Medicaid portion is costing us now?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi."

Murphy, M.: "No."

Salvi: "No."

Murphy, M.: "Okay. Now with regard to the compliance having endured the loss of a very intended child and knowing how sorrowful that situation can be, I was going to ask you about the compliance with federal guidelines. If someone that suffers a miscarriage or a late term birth and the baby does not survive. If that woman needs to have a D and C or some other operative procedure, would we be in compliance with federal guidelines?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Yes. We are in total compliance with federal guidelines. This Bill specifically addresses the federal guidelines and says that the State of Illinois will comply with all federal guidelines. And I appreciate the fact that you brought that up because there was some misinformation. For example, I would like to point, if I may, to the fiscal note. As amended the fiscal note states as follows, now the fiscal note was amended because this Bill was amended. So for those of you who say that this is our second bite at the apple, I will point out that this Bill has never been before this Body. When we presented this...when we

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

presented Senate Bill 662 to this Body we fell two votes And several of you, six or seven of you, said that your concern was that we were not meeting the federal quidelines and that funds were therefore at risk. drafted this language, we had our lawyers draft this language and it specifically references federal guidelines. says that we shall stay in compliance with federal quidelines. So please don't be misled by that. I wish that those statements were made in the form of a question to me so that I could have addressed them right away. me read the fiscal note. The wrong fiscal note was read to you earlier. That's not the fiscal note on this Bill. fiscal note on this Bill, as amended, this Bill has never been before us savs, 'the Health Care Financing Administration currently requires states to reimburse for abortions to preserve the life of the mother and in cases were pregnancy has resulted from rape or incest. Failure to comply with the federal mandate jeopardizes our obtaining matching federal funding. Senate Bill 662, as amended, and that's this Bill, which has never been before us, current departmental practice which was implemented as a result of court orders for funding of abortions which includes the federal requirements and also adds an additional requirement which is the life of the So I would point out that those who say that this Bill is not in compliance with federal guidelines, I would point out that they are simply wrong. The Bill specifically says, that we shall comply with all federal guidelines. So we will save money, millions of dollars if you look at what...how many of these abortions we paid for before this, a similar Act was passed 15 years ago and was the law of the land for 15 years. We saved...we saved

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

millions of dollars and I'm asking you to bring back that law with one exception, one addition, the exception for rape and incest. So thank you, Representative for asking that question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy M.: "Yes. To the Bill. The voters did speak last November and they've spoken in many of our polls. men and women of Illinois do not want to add to the abortion industry pockets and pay for abortion because it was the wrong gender. Because it's a cheap, easy, free, on our back method of birth control. Because the birth was unintentional I wonder how many walk our streets are in this chamber that were so well intended. Or because might be unloved and if they're not going to have a happy life let's kill them in the womb and let's have taxpayers pay for it. If you want a behavior to be less you don't make it free and easy and available. The taxpayers have said no, if the person needs to have medical treatment, federal guidelines will be complied with. I urge your."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers." Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. think what we need to do here is state our conflict of interest. We're passing a Bill saying that we don't want pay for an indigent woman...abortion and yet we've also passed legislation that stated that we don't want to for an indigent woman who've had more than two or three kids. So now make up your mind which one that you want T think it's unfortunate that we have to here. addressing this issue again. We have not done anything positive in regards to poor women. So therefore we're going to try to force them to have a child and then once

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

that child gets here you don't want to help take care of that child. Now if you want to help take care of this child, you should stand up and let's increase the budget. But already we've...there's a difference between DCFS dollars and public aid dollars because if you're a part of licensed DCFS person that means that you get more money and then if you're a part of public aid well you don't get that much. So we already know the value of these people is not very much. So I think this is a bad Bill and I would appreciate if we would all defeat it again. Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "Representative Salvi, I have a fiscal note here. It's on the letterhead of the Illinois Department of Public Aid. It's a fiscal note for Senate Bill 662 as amended and it is signed and it is dated March 17th. Now does this apply to your Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Representative Biggert, I don't know what you have in your hand. I have a fiscal note that was signed by Michael Murphy, Chief Legislation External Affairs Illinois Department of Public Aid, dated May 23, 1995. And you have one dated in March. I don't know where you got that fiscal note or what...but I assume that, that fiscal note referred to the Bill before we amended it. We amended this Bill in committee to include the rape and incest exception."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The fiscal note and I would

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

like to read it says, that 'the Health Care Financing Administration is requiring states to reimburse for abortions to preserve the life of the mother and as a result of rape and incest. This Bill keeps the language in Illinois law, which is more restrictive than the federal mandate. Failure to comply with the federal mandate jeopardizes our obtaining matching federal funds.' So I would suggest that there still is a question about the language of this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Representative, I don't know how many times I have to say this. You simply have the wrong note. That obviously refers to the Bill before we put rape and incest as an exception and if we had no rape, incest exception in this Bill. If it weren't this Bill then you would be right but it's this Bill that we're talking about. And this fiscal note says that we are in complete compliance with the federal guidelines because we have a rape and incest exception."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Mr. Speaker, again to the Bill. I understand that there are two notes and that is in question. But I would like to refer to the Pennsylvania case which is now on appeal that was stated a little bit before. But this case that it was before the U.S. District Court in Pennsylvania, the judge held that where there is something that is further than just the...where somebody has to report, the victim has to report either incest or where there has been rape to authorities that this goes further than the federal mandate. And I would suggest that what this Bill does is, to jeopardize the federal funds for the State of Illinois. And I would urge that you oppose the Bill."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor of this Bill would have us think that now the Bill, in respect to rape and incest, has been taken care of and that protections that women victims of rape and incest can get an abortion. Let's be clear here, when we talk about rape and incest we're talking about victims of crimes, those are crimes. what Mr. Salvi's Bill does now is say, that any woman is a victim of this crime, in order to make use of her constitutional right to have an abortion and her legal right to have an abortion, if she is a victim of rape or incest, must report that crime. Now let's talk about real world. Let's talk about a 14 year old girl who is the victim of incest. Something, on the one hand, that she might not even realize is a crime, Representative. restitutions where young girls are victimized in their own house and do not know that this is not the way things are or the way things have to be and that they are victims of a crime. Now in addition to the trauma of a pregnancy relating to that, this young girl has be brought into the criminal justice system. Now certainly the perpetrator of that crime should be brought to justice but the victim in reality is going to be that young girl who now in an abortion has to also go and say, it was my stepfather who did it. We are making her a double victim of Or let's take the woman who was raped, one of the crime. unreported crimes, six weeks later this woman discovers that she was raped. Now she goes in for an abortion and she is questioned, well why is it that didn't report this crime at the time, how do we know that

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

you're telling the truth, maybe you're just trying to say that you're a victim of rape. And now she, through the criminal justice system, is herself made to be treated like a criminal. I can't imagine a Bill that is meaner to women who are trying to deal with the trauma of having been the victim of a very serious and yet may often unreported crime. I think this is double victimization of poor women who, by law, are suppose to be able to avail themselves of this health care service. I can't believe that at this late hour that we're even having to deal with this Bill. We have dealt with it once already, we have defeated a very similar measure, almost exact measure, despite what Sponsor says. Let's go home without having to divide this Body on this very contentious question. We don't need to with it, we've dealt with it but if we have to and it seems that we've been forced to. The only responsible way to deal with this is to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from McHenry, Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Two years ago I voted against a Bill to provide funding for our state insurance plan for abortion and for Medicaid on demand. But I rise in opposition to this Bill. In the State of Illinois irrespective of what the federal mandates are. I believe that women and children who are the victims of rape, who are the victims of incest, just because they don't have resources, have as their only option to continue a pregnancy that someone else might not or to be forced into a back alley and be further victimized. And I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Scott."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I also rise in strong opposition to this Bill. Abortion in the State of Illinois is legal and I understand that the Sponsor doesn't necessarily agree with that position and would like to see that changed and I realize there are other people who have that same opinion and I certainly respect that opinion. I certainly respect their right to have that opinion but it is legal. And so now what we're saying is that the rights that people of means have to that legal procedure, we're going to deny to people who do not have the means. I think there are major points in addition to the constitutional argument. I think it's wrong to exclude from this benefit poor people. It's another, another attempt of this General Assembly, at least by some people, to carry out another attack on the rights of poor people. We've done it before. I don't think we should be in the position of doing again. You know we talked a lot before, when we were talking about welfare reform. It was incredibly important during that debate to get people off of dependency, to move people into work. Because it built self-esteem, because it did things for these people that helped to deal with themselves. But now what you're saying to these people who are in these situations where they're poor is that you're still second class citizens. We are going to treat you differently, you are going to be treated differently and not have this option available to you. I'll also submit to you that I understand why rape and incest exemptions were added to this Bill. Because I listened to the debate very carefully last time and yes there were some people that had some concerns with that. But I'll submit to you that is an illogical place to draw the line.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

you drew the line, at the life of the mother you were making a determination that protecting the mother's life was very important. When you draw the line at rape incest, as horrible as those two things are, now you're making value judgments based on what the life of the child is going to be like. We're making it based on what we think the trauma to the mother is going to be like. And who, in the world, are we to decide that, particular trauma is worse than other any trauma that a woman might be going through and that life that, that child have might be worse than any other life? That's a political move to put it into the Bill to try to get votes. But I'll submit to everybody in here that it's totally illogical, as a way to draw the line with respect to public of abortions. Ι also believe unconstitutional arguments but I don't think that's the most important thing. I think the most important part of this particular piece of legislation and why we should defeat it is that this procedure is legal and we should not be in the position of saying, that yes it's legal but because you don't have the means, you don't have the ability to have this procedure available to you. It should be every person's right, it should be every person's choice as long as that procedure is legal. And I urge everyone to please vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Grundy,
Representative Spangler."

Spangler: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. And Representative Salvi to close."

Salvi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we all say we want

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

abortion to be rare. Our President said so and he was the one who implemented the order that we are complying with in this Bill. But everything we seem to do makes Those of us who went out on the campaign more common. trails, let me ask each and everyone of you. Did you say I support taxpayer funding of elective abortions? think too many of you did. I think most of you opposed it and the reason you opposed it is because you know the people don't want it. Because it's not right to make the taxpayers pay for an elective abortion. Abortion is not health care. Now the Representative who said that this is a constitutional right and therefore the taxpavers should out their wallets for these elective abortions. I would say to you, traveling is a constitutional traveling across the country is a constitutional right but the taxpayers don't pay for it. This Bill insures that are in compliance with federal rules. I want to state that very clearly, this Bill specifically says, we shall comply with federal rules. That means we shall pay for rape and incest abortions. Read the Bill. The last thing I would like to address is the issue of reporting. There... I heard from some of the Members of the other side of the aisle that it is a terrible thing that we are asking that there be a report filed if there's a case of incest. What would you have this child do? Would you have someone not report? Would you rather just have this individual go in and have a free abortion and go back to the abusive situation? You're right. Rape and incest are under reported. This Bill will insure that there will he more reporting. This Bill explicitly complies with federal requirements. Even the Illinois Department of Public Aid wrote, in the amended fiscal note when we amended this

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Bill, that this fully complies with federal guidelines. And not only will...will this mean that we will not be jeopardizing any federal dollars but we will save millions of dollars as well. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that your constituents support and there's good reason. The people have a lot of common sense, they may or may not support the right of an abortion. But they do not support paying for elective abortions. Vote 'no'...or vote 'yes'' on House Bill 2403."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopted Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2403?' A11 those in favor signify by voting 'ave': opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted The Clerk will who wish? take the record. question. there are 60 'ayes', 46 'noes', and 3 voting 'present'. And the Lady, Representative Currie. requested a Verification of the Affirmative Roll. Mr. Clerk, read the affirmative roll. Representative Currie. Representative Cowlishaw and Representative Johnson ask leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Representative Black and Representative Wennlund."

Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives voting the affirmative: Ackerman. Balthis. Biggins. Black. Bost. Churchill. Brady. Buqielski. Cowlishaw. Durkin. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hoeft. Hoffman. Holbrook. Johnson, Tim. Johnson, Tom. Jones, John. Kubik. Lawfer. Leitch. Lyons. Mautino. Madigan. McAuliffe. Meyer. Moffitt. Murphy, Maureen. Myers. Noland. Novak. O'Connor. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Phelps. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Skinner. Smith. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Turner, John. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zabrocki. Zickus. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, questions of the affirmative roll?"

Currie: "Representative Deering?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Deering. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative Deering on House Bill 2403

Conference Committee Report #1 is recorded as voting 'affirmative'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering? The Gentleman is not in the chambers, remove him from the roll call. Anything further?"

Currie: "Representative Black?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black? I'm sorry,
Representative Currie, I did verify him, that's my error.
He's been verified. Representative Deering has returned to
the chambers, he's in the rear of the chambers. Restore
him to the 'affirmative' roll call. Representative Currie,
any further questions?"

Currie: "Representative Bugielski?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bugielski is in the rear of the chambers."

Currie: "Nothing further."

Speaker Daniels: "On this question, there are 60 'aye', 46 'no',

3 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference
Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2403. And this Bill,
having received the required Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. Adjournment Resolution. Ladies
and Gentlemen of the House, we still have work left to do
but we want to adopt our Adjournment Resolution so,

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

prepared to adjourn when its the appropriate time. The Senate is still meeting, they're acting on the budget as we speak. When they have completed their budget matters and a few other matters Bills we will be prepared to adjourn. But for the moment we are going to adopt the Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #45, offered by Representative Churchill. Resolved by the House of Representative of the 89th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein; when the House of Representatives on Friday, May 26, 1995, it adjourned until Friday, October 20, 1995 at 12:00 o'clock noon in Perfunctory Session. And when it adjourns on that day it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 1, 12:00 o'clock noon. And when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 26, 1995, it stands adjourned until Friday, October 20, 1995 at 11:00 o'clock a.m. And when it adjourns on that day it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 1, 1995 at 12:00 o'clock noon."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill, moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted. Senate Bill 907. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 907, First Conference Committee Report has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank You, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 907, the First Conference Committee Report is rather extensive Bill. Let me go through the provisions, all of these proposals have been, have been acted upon before but wanted to make sure that we all know

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

what they are. (Senate Bill) 907 would include the Water Reclamation District Act to allow the use of bid bonds instead of deposits provided the bonds are issued by surety company. It contains the Amendment which was adopted by this House with respect to condominium...subject the provisions of the Condominium Property Act. contains provisions of House Bill 1212, which were offered by the Department of Revenue, I know of no opposition to those provisions. It offers...it deals with the issue of a manufacture purchase credit which is an issue that we spoke about earlier this year. It would also include Senate Amendment #1. to House Bill 1212 which amends Enterprise Zone Act to change the sales tax credit for the purchase of building materials that will be easier for them to use. This change is...requested by Motorola and is also an agreed provision. Another provision which also brought over to this House, has to do with amending the Illinois Income Tax Act to distinguish between types of capital gains dividends of regulated investment companies located in Illinois. This is supported by Department of Revenue and 'Grant Thorton'. In addition to that provisions on Senate Bill 295, which will allow the Department of Revenue to develop sales tax revenue to any village that does not levy a property tax. provision that was Senate Bill 412, which authorizes the Cook County Forest Preserve District to swap land parcels with Acme Steel Company, it also includes provisions that deal with the Water Reclamation District that would allow personnel director to limit the duration of eligible list of one year as opposed to three for student programs and entry level engineering positions. These lists are far out dated and I felt that one year would be sufficient.

70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

would offer new language as requested by Senator DeAngelis. to amend the Public Office of Prohibited Activities Act and would clarify that local government officials would be able to hold two offices if the offices were not in conflict. It also offered new language as requested by Senator Karpiel on behalf of Cook County States Attorney, Jack O'Malloy, provided that if the Cook County purchasing officer is purchasing supply or contractual services which can be obtained through the correctional industry, the purchasing agency is expressly required to solicit seal bids from the Department of Corrections. And the is, new language which amends the Property Tax Code to allow county boards and counties which have been designated in whole or in part as disaster areas by the President or the Governor, to adopt ordinance to postpone the due date of property tax payment and not charge interest on the amount due. These are the provisions of the Conference Committee. I'd be happy to try to respond to any questions you might have and would appreciate your support."

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

Fantin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm asking for an 'aye' vote. These here are all Bills that have been heard, have been passed unanimously and the Bill that I'm most concerned with was 412. This was a land exchange. This is going to help my district and for many of us, tremendously. We are going to have a project that will be worth over \$300 million that will help keep a steel mill, help keep 1900 people working in our area. I ask you, please for an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 907, the language in this Legislation as the previous speaker noted, will allow 1900 jobs in the south suburban area of Cook County to continue. It's an expansion of approximately \$380 million for a steel mill and I would ask for your support and an 'aye' vote on this Legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Legislation, as the previous speaker just said, it would benefit a number of people in the south suburban community to the tune of some 1700 new jobs. And for that reason, I also rise, that is the district of Representative Harold Murphy support...lives in and I rise in support this Senate Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Spangler."

Spangler: "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, and Representative Kubik to close. Representative Kubik, moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 907. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question there are 109 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 907 and this Bill, having received a required Constitutional Majority, is

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

hereby declared passed. House Resolution #54. Representative Murphy. Take that out of the record. House Bill 1279. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Supplemental Calendar #3."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1279, First Conference Committee Report, approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1279, contains a number of things that I know are great concern to us. Last year as we worked in medicaid and this year as we worked in medicaid, it has three issues in it. of them is the mandatory implementation of the photo ID system, the electronic benefits fund system that is urgently to stop fraud in the medicaid system and to move our medicaid system into the next age. If you want to see what Jane Doe, looks like, Jane Doe is on this photo This is a relative inexpensive system and it's card. important one that we get finally in Illinois can get our medicaid system under control. The secondly piece of this Legislation eliminates guarantees that we were extremely concerned about last year but, at the last minute got into the Bill. As you know, the manage care community networks that are proposed under media plan plus, not have yet defined their financial requirements. do as a result the state wound up so, on for...through 1995, through 1998, for 90% of any insolvency in bankruptcy cost from '98to the year 2001, still on the hook for 80% of it and from the year 2001 to...and five 75% of it. The state should not have to pay twice and so it is very important that we remove this language. The third thing this does is extend to other communities, notably Rockford, Champaign, our friends at Southern Illinois

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

University and to mulate what we are working to do in Peoria with respect to putting together downstate manage care community networks that work very, very effectively through the University of Illinois schools of medicine. This is a very innovating demonstration, a project that we are working on and it's a very important Bill to many of us downstate as well. These are three very outstanding reasons to vote for this Bill. It's a Bill that I believe enjoys bipartisan support because I've talked to many of you about it and I would that this Conference Committee Report be adopted."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "No one has spoken to me about it, if there is."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "David, I have a memo here dated, May 26, from the Illinois Hospital Association opposing the Conference Committee Report to this Bill. Now, I'm not quiet sure why that is, so I thought you might be able to give us some insight into why the Hospital Association would opposed this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "The Hospital Association last year was instrumental in having this provision crammed down our throats at the very last minute, to be just totally honest. Because they want it both ways. They wanted...they wanted the opportunity to have the managed Care community networks in especially

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Chicago, and they also wanted it in the event it didn't work, to have the state come back and pay...foot the bill. So, I'm sure that they would not want to see that removed but I totally disagree with them and I will tell you, this is very important to protecting the financial fiscal and financial risk of this state. We don't want to be on the hook for this and we must insist that we're not on the hook for this."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "How would this impact our areas and hospitals downstate, David?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "What some of us are doing and I know in the Peoria area, is we are working with our major hospitals together with the University of Illinois school of medicine, in our case and others I know in southern are very interested, together in Springfield, and Rockford, and in Champaign to integrate and unite the hospital system there with the advantages of the universities assets as they pertain to medicine in youngsters to strengthen the primary care and rural care programs and to put together an effective community based program that units the strengths of our medical services as opposed to having just left to be in a defused kind of state. And it's a very important opportunity for downstate Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "I hear a great deal of discussion among friend in Chicago that we should be opposed to this as well. So, that's what makes me concerned about our downstate hospitals. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a HMO filed bankruptcy, would our local hospital be protected under current law and would that change under your proposed

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "No, there is a very big difference between HOM's which already exist, which already have financial history, which already have regulations with which they must comply through the Department of Insurance which has specified these. The regulations and financial rules for managed care networks have not yet...they will be new in any event and they have not been specified and beyond that point, HMO's have a 'Guarantee' Association which in the event HMO goes under the 'Guarantee' Association steps in and deals with this. That is not specified in the cases of managed care community networks."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you would allow some of my colleagues from Chicago, to answer questions, or ask questions. Because it's important to everybody in this room to know how this impacts their own hospitals. David, one last question from me. The Hospital Association has not talked talked to you about their opposition to this?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "No."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Is this the same Hospital Association that would take a neutral position on a budget that cuts hospitals \$400 million and froze rates?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Well, I think many of us would have real questions about what that Association was doing this Session."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, Representative, I appreciate your frankness and

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

I'm going listen to your other answers because I'm not that familiar with this issue. That's why I was asking these questions. So, I appreciate your frankness in regards to this matter and the answers you've given."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Committee notice."

Clerk McLennand: "Notice. Rules Committee will meet on Friday,
May 26, 8:15 p.m., Speaker's Conference Room. Rules
Committee 8:15, Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There are two good provisions in this Legislation, the electronic benefits program and also the demonstration project in But I make strenuous objection to the part of the Peoria. report that would abolish before we started the insolvency protections that were an essential ingredient discussion to move into media plan plus last year. There has so far in this Assembly been no changes to the agreement that we made last year when we created the media plan plus plan and of course as you know, we haven't even begun to see how and whether that plan will work as we wait for our federal waiver. But there are two good reasons for opposing the idea of eliminating before it begins insolvency protections that we crafted for the media plan plus program, one reason is that first it applies only to the medicaid HMO's or the managed community care networks organization that are likely to be not-for-profit, that do not meet the requirements of the HMO Act. The HMO's can take care of themselves, they're required to insolvency protections. They are required to have a mix patient population. But we created the manage community care networks, so that institutions like Mount Sinai Hospital in Chicago. Or St. Marys in East St. Louis, might

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

be able to develop a manage care framework of their own. Other organizations federally qualified health centers, for example, might also be the necleus of the development of a manage care program. I don't know who wants to make a contract with this brand new group, a contract to provide a service without some guarantee that payment will be Remember that people who offer health care to the poor today, today they get paid by the medicaid department. And even though the money is slow and even though the money is they know at the end of the day they'll get their bucks. If you're dealing with a brand new organization, you might be a little skeptical. So, I think we owe it to the providers of care, the people that we aren't going to pay up front anymore, we owe them the guarantee that they are not offering the service and that they will never paid. Secondly, I would urge the point that our Department of Public Aid is likely to do a better job of regulating, of managing, of watching both the fiscal and quality care issues in these newly forming organizations, if they are not off the financial hook. What would make them more likely to see to it that the Mount Sinai HMO, or the the St. Marys in East St. Louis, MCCN that they are actually doing the job then if they don't, the Department of Public Aid is going to have to pay twice. We should not turn our back on a carefully crafted agreement that we made but one year ago. If we want to make changes in media plan plus, I would say that the changes we should make was those Representative Black and I offered to see to it that we don't have the scandals that have developed with the medicaid HMO program in states like Florida and California. These are important protections that we were offering the providers of health care, an incentive for them not just to

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26. 1995

sign up with Chicago HMO, the other for-profit HMO's but an incentive for them to work through the not-for-profit community as well. Keeping the state on the hook means the state will play its proper regulatory role and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Conference Committee Report in the hopes that the Sponsor would offer us a Second with items one and three, leaving two out of consideration. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was away from my switch, I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' on 2403, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so indicate, Sir. If you switch had been working properly. Okay. The Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."
- Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I too, rise on a point of personal privilege. I incorrectly voted on Senate Bill 907, I would like the record to reflect a 'present' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "If your switch had been working properly, you would have been voted 'present' and the Journal will so reflect. Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, thank you. Mr. Speaker. I agree with Representative Leitch, that this newly formed managed network is a very good program for us downstate and especially in the Peoria area. We're sitting with two big medical complex that have been in competition with each other for many years. They've been at odds, they've been in competition for the medical business within that area, they work with HMO's and now they are ready to come with this program and working with the University of Illinois. At this time, I do think that we are ready for this program. I see nothing wrong with it, I know that it can

# 70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

be successful and I'm urging the downstate people and the people on this side of the aisle to vote 'yes' on this program."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. I inadvertently hit my 'yes' button on 907 and would like to be recorded as a 'present' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so record...reflect.

  Representative Durkin, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it. Representative Leitch to close."
- Leitch: "I just need to renew my remarks about the importance of protecting the state and its fiscal position going out into the future. Public Aid doesn't want to baby sit shakey manage care community networks. The guys who come in from Florida with sunburn...sunburns and suntans going and setting up these shakey things then have us at risk for paying twice. You've got to be out of your mind. This thing got rammed down our throats last year as a last minute deal to get this thing put together in this manage care thing. This is our opportunity to correct it, it is very important that we correct this, this year and I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right, Representative Granberg, are you requesting a verification? All right the Gentleman has so requested a verification, Representative Leitch, of this roll call. So, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1279?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 68 'aye', 40 'no', and 1 voting 'present, and the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg, removes his objection and request for a verification and this Bill, the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1279. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Biggins. Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Yes, thanks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on personal privilege. Earlier today, Ι inadvertently, while working Senate Bill 368, working this side of the aisle was trying to convince some of my colleagues that they should vote for the Bill. The was called, I tried to get back to my switch in time, however, I didn't get here. Now, I understand that we can have two options here, if I can ask that, I'd be...wished that I'd been recorded on the roll or perhaps the Body would allow the invoking of the once used Feigenholtz's Amendments and we could possibly have everybody stay here a little while longer and take an extra vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Biggins, the record will reflect that had been able to jump start and reach your switch, you would have voted in the affirmative on the stated Bill.

House Resolution #54. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution #..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Murphy."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution #54, recommends, do approve for consideration."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I bring before this Body House Resolution

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

54, that pledges support for Midway Airport. That the development of a third major airport in the northeast region of the State of Illinois has been and is the focus of ongoing studies and debate. Whereas, the comprehensive planning of a third major airport must encompass the future the existing metropolitan airports. Whereas. Illinois-Indiana Regional Airport, site selection report. dated November of '91, states that if Midway Airport is to remain open, even on a limited basis, the airspace and air problems will be significantly more control difficult to resolve for the Gary and Lake Calumet sites compared to the Bi-State, Kankakee, and Peotone sites. Lake Calumet would require, at a minium, the closure of Midway to air carrier operations. Whereas, pursuant to the compact recently entered into between the City of Chicago and Gary. Indiana. the City of Chicago is and will be transferring millions of dollars to Gary, Indiana, for the purpose of developing, expanding, and marketing Gary as a viable commercial airport. And whereas, Midway Airport, strategically located on the southwest side of the City of Chicago, is the major economic stabilizing force in the southwest region of the metropolitan area of the City of Chicago. And whereas, the citizens of the southwest the city and the citizens of many nearby southwest suburbs depend on and benefit from the economic development generated by the operations at Midway Airport. strong support for the continuation of commercial air operations at Midway Airport has been urged by the Southwest Conference of Mayors. Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we are supportive of the development of a third major airport only if

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Airport remains as a viable air transportation center with the ability to operate at full capacity airport maintaining, at least, the current level of today's operations."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. With all due respect to the distinguish list of Sponsors on House Resolution #54. Let me suggest to you that there's not a need for a third airport in the south suburbs. City of Chicago and the metropolitan area has two viable, in healthy airports and one international airport that is really the economic lifeline of our region in our state, businesses, commercial enterprises depend heavily on the good operation of both O'Hare and Midway, and I think everyone in this state should very proud of the operations of those two airports. Let us only look to our cousins in Colorado and in Denver, Colorado to see the potential for disaster in investing public funds in an unneeded third airport. I would suggest to you that with the changing workplace and the changing demographic patterns in our region that investigation, let alone investment into a third airport in the southern suburbs is foolhardy and frankly, a waste of taxpayers time and money. Let us make sure that O'Hare International Airport and Midway Airport stay viable, efficient, are cost effective, work well, help attract businesses to our state. Airports should not be just for some region of the state, anymore than the purpose of a prison is for pork for certain region of the state. Are anymore than a mental health center, is a piece of pork for a certain region of this state. Airports are vital part of our transportation system, we have a world class city in Chicago. The State of Illinois invest millions

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

millions of dollars in tourism, we need to continue and increase those tourism dollars. Let me suggest to you that are efforts are much better channeled at figuring out ways to increase visitors to our city and not to digress and divert our attention down a path where money is going to be ill spent on an effort that is doomed, I would suggest to you. All of us know that the major airlines have no interest in a third airport. Let us not go down this path. So, Representative Murphy, I rise in strong opposition to this Resolution. I think that we need to concentrate on trying to invest more dollars in tourism and economic development in the existing airports and the in the visitor industry in this state. Let Chicago, not become another Denver Airport. Thank you, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "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 Murphy to close."

Murphy: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. And again, I do want to point out the list of Sponsors and I didn't find a fiscal note in my fortune cookie but I did find this little saying. 'The secret of politics is the build bridges instead of walls'. I would like to have whoever would like to join us in Co-Sponsoring this Resolution. Think about it. Vote 'yes', we want strong suburban Midway Airport. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Resolution 54. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question there is 74 'ayes', 24 'nays', 11 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 54. Senate Bill 949. Read the

- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 949, a Motion to recede from House

  Amendment #1 and 2, have been approved for consideration."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move...I would move that we recede from House Amendment #1 and 2, to Senate Bill 949."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, actually Representative Lang wants to speak on the Bill. I just...inquiry of the Clerk, as to whether or not my light bulb got burned out up there. It's been on for about two or three hours now and it seems to work fine here but, it's been having the darnest time up there. I just checking to see if the Clerk had any problems up there."
- Speaker Daniels: "I think it was blinking."
- Dart: "Oh, okay. Because for the last two or three hours it's been working pretty good down here and I was just making sure it was going up there too. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Sir. Thank you. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had the same problem that Mr. Dart has had but I'm sure you'll have it worked out by the time we come back for Veto Session."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."
- Lang: "Or whatever Special Sessions are required. You don't want to hear my speech on the budget now, do you, Sir."
- Speaker Daniels: "It's your four minutes."
- Lang: "No, that's okay. Representative, you want to recede from

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

these Amendments, what do the Amendments do and what will be left in the Bill after you recede?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: 'Representative Lang, the Amendments had to do with the City of Chicago and had to do with abandoned buildings. The Senate disagreed with those Amendments, did not want to adopt the Amendments and oddly enough the people who are objecting it, were Legislators from the City of Chicago. So, in order to save a Bill that helps Representative Deering and Representative Skinner, I agreed to ...I agreed to recede from the Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "What will the Bill do after we recede?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "The Bill would allow two municipalities...two areas to incorporate. One is a place called 'Doseaville', which is down on the Mississippi River, down by 'Cascasia' Island and the other area is Trout Valley in McHenry County."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. You know, Representative, I've reviewed my file on this and, no I don't want to do my budget speech. I've reviewed my file on this and I found something in here that I haven't had a chance to talk about. This may be our last chance to talk about this. I found a phoney fiscal note. Now, it may be that this has been corrected, it probably has been. So, an inquiry of the Clerk, do we have a good fiscal note on this Bill? Mr. Nemerovski, apparently does everything up there."

Speaker Daniels: "Everything, okay. It's all okay now, Sir."

Lang: "Well, while he checks that out. Representative, have you had a chance to take a look at this phoney fiscal note?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Kubik: "Representative, when we did the Amendments, which I might point out were offered by your side of the aisle. We made sure that those notes were carefully filed and were in order. So, I don't have my file with me right now but I do remember you...I do remember at that time that you got up and asked about all of these sorts of things and I think we've had this dialogue before, was it Yoge Bear, who said, 'It's like Deja vu all over again'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I would imagine, and now since we've talked about fiscal notes, fiscal notes are now germane. Do you want to move this to a position where we can attach House Resolution 49, to this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative Lang, I'm doing this for Representative Skinner, who that might not impress you, but I am doing it for Representative Deering, now that may impress you. Representative Deering would like to have this Bill passed and I'm trying to assist him, in doing that. So, I don't think that it would be appropriate to take this Bill to Conference. I think it would be best to send this to the Governor and then everybody would be happy."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I've had numerous requests on my side side of the aisle, notable from, Mr. Scott and Mr. Dart. Mr. Giles is smiling about it too. They would really like to see a continuing investigation of this fiscal note problem, this Notegate. You're in a position, this is one of the last few Bills of the Session, to do something about it. You want to help us?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kubik."
Kubik: "No."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I would like observe that this not for one specific community in McHenry County. There are several densely populated areas that believe that they ought to have the ability to incorporate in this most rapidly growing county in the State of Illinois. I just wanted to put that on the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know, Representative Lang, feel very passionately about this Bill and wants to speak on this Bill as he has the other 2,479. I was going to yield him my time but, I've reconsidered. I would like to move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The And the Gentleman, Representative Kubik, moves that the House recede from House Amendments #1 and 2, Senate Bill 949. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will the record. On this question there are 108 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House recede from House Amendments #1 and 2, to Senate Bill 949. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee meeting immediately, Speaker's

Conference Room. Rules immediately Speaker's Conference

Room."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

On House Bill 150, my button inadvertently pressed as 'yes', and I would like to be recorded as voting 'present' on that."

Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Senate Bill 405.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 405, a Motion to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1, has been filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Speaker Daniels: "So, your Motion Sir, is the Motion to recede from House Amendment #1. As that correct, Sir? Okay."

Skinner: "That is correct."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Representative, the Illinois Association of Relators had passed out a sheet, I know they were against this Bill.

What's their position after this...this movement that you're making here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, may I explain what the Amendment is that we're receding from and that might clear it up. There are four...there are four parts to the Bill originally. The first part was a fee increase. But don't tell anybody, okay. This was for law libraries in four counties. The second part was one that would make Todd Stroger's father disturbed, it was to train to change the appointment power for a fire protection district in Barrington township from the Cook County board president to the township trustees in which the fire protection district lay. The third

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Amendment was an Amendment which allowed a county board to enact an anti-gang ordinance. The fourth Amendment was a Section which allowed a judge to allow a defendant to contribute an amount not to exceed...not to exceed the fine that a defendant would have in order to make contributions to anti-drug or anti-alcohol or alcohol abuse or drug abuse groups or anti-gang or gang prevention originations. So, I am moving to...I'm moving to recede from the one that the Cook County Board president would not like. It has nothing to do with the Real Estate Association. They were anticipating...Representative, they were antic...the Real Estate Association was anticipating a Conference Committee Report which will not exist. Does not exist."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't think...I'm not trying to stale, I think I've got to get to the bottom of this and I think there's only two minutes when I started." Speaker Daniels: "Sure."

Hoffman: "So, if I could have another three minutes we can figure this out, I think. So...let me ask you this. This Bill, is there anything left in this Bill that would have to do with the procedures that entitles the private property owner to disconnect from a municipality?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "There was never anything in the Bill about that. There is nothing in the Bill about that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "So what you're telling the Body is, you do not think as this currently exist the Relators Association would be in opposition to this."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "No, I don't. They weren't in opposition to the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

original Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, I think...I think there is a grave concern here with that association. I think the concern is warranted. I think that if you look at what this Bill does, property owners. What this Bill could conceivably do to property owners, what this Bill could do to home owners and what this Bill could do to office owners building...building owners. I think you would vote 'no' too. I don't think that we should allow this...this action I would respectfully disagree with the Representative who is Sponsoring this Bill. It's understanding that the Relators Association is opposed to this action and I would ask a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Representative Skinner, we have discovered that this Bill, as you speak, is actually in Rules Committee. So, your Motion is inappropriate. I want everyone to keep in mind the debate that you had in your head there and so, if your Motion is approved and comes out of rules, we'll get back to it. Senate Bill 760. And tell me if that's cleared Rules Committee, Clerk."

Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to recede from House Amendment 2, to Senate Bill 760. This was an Amendment to a Bill, it was a Ryder Amendment to Bill Sponsored by Representative Black. It dealt with the Automobile Dealer License Renewals and in the original Legislation all the money would be going to George Ryan's Office. Then there was a dispute and in the Amendment which, Mr. Black had wanted and an agreement that was made, half the money would

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

go to George Ryan and half would go to IDOT. After that went over to the Senate, they said, no, no, no, we'll talk again and now they have decided that it's all going to go to George Ryan. So, by receding from this it goes back to the way it was originally. George gets the money, but he also agrees not to take 1.5 million out of the road fund that he was trying to do earlier in this Session also. So, by receding all parties will be now happy. So, I so move for happiness."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative Pankau. So, George Ryan and...George Ryan, won't receive it but of States Office will receive the money. How much will they receive under that Legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "About \$50,000."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And the Secretary of State would rather have the \$50,000 than the \$150 million in road fund?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Probably not, but I guess it's the best deal he could make this Session."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And the funds originally were supposed go to, Mr. Ryan. Representative Black, indicated he wanted to split the receipts and half go to IDOT. What were they to be used at the Department of Transportation. For what purpose?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Granberg: "For what reason were they supposed to be used by

Department of Transportation. You indicated the

Amendments, split the proceeds. Previously all the funds

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

were to go to the Secretary of States. Representative Black's Amendment split the proceeds, half were to go to George, and half were to go to the Department of Transportation. What were the funds to be used at the...what were they to be used for at the Department of Transportation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "There were just going to go into the road fund, for use of whatever."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And are they going to be used in the same manner by the Secretary of State?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "No, I believe he's going to use it for the daily operations of his office, since he's the one that licenses the auto dealers."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, do the new and used car dealers have a position on the Legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Yes, they are in favor of it. Everybody is in favor of it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg, do you want to state your position on this."

Granberg: "Oh, in about two minutes. I'm still making up my mind, it's very difficult. So, Representative Pankau, so if we recede from this Amendment this will go directly to the Governor and the Secretary of State will receive this, approximately \$50,000 and how are these funds derived? Where do they come from?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "The funds come from the auto dealer registration fee.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

That is administrated by Secretary of State, Ryan's Office."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Is that a new fee, Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "No. No."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau. Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, where do the funds go currently? Are you changing the...you're changing where the funds actually qo?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "No, the funds currently go to the Secretary of State."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, the...Representative, why don't you look that over
 with your staff. Does it not increase the fees and change
 where they go?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "This Amendment does not increase the fees. The original Bill, Sponsored by Representative Black, did increase the fees and they were originally going to the road fund. And this Amendment, if we recede from this Amendment, it straightens it all out. So, for 43 seconds let's just straighten it out and vote for this."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative Pankau. That really helped me make up my mind. Your answers were very forthright and I certainly appreciate frankness, and how can we be against George Ryan. An excellent public official, done an outstanding job for the people of this state. So, we work on a bipartisan basis. The Secretary is a wonderful public servant, does his best for all the people regardless of Party, regardless of their

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

location. He just tries to do his best and so, I agree, we should recede from this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Ladies Motion. I hope Representative Granberg, wasn't being facetious. This Amendment has been worked out with IDOT, with the Secretary of State, the automobile dealers. The underlying Bill is extremely important to them. Their franchise agreements start expiring in August, and without this underlying Bill they have no form to address disputes between themselves and manufactures. So, I hope you will join with the Lady and recede from the Amendment. It has been agreed to by all Parties. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'aves' have it. Representative Pankau to close. The Ladv. Representative Pankau, moves that the House recede from House Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question there are 109 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendments #1, to Senate Bill 760. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 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

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

referred, action taken on May 26, 1995. Reported the same back, do approve for consideration Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 1140; Conference Committee Report #2, to Senate Bill 1039; and Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1108. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, a Motion to recede is approved for consideration for House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 405."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pankau. Representative. Clerk, read House Joint Resolution 21."

Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #21, requires the Economic and Fiscal Commission to do a study of welfare benefits from all government services received by families receiving aid to families of dependent children."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 21, and 22, came out of some recommendations by a man I have become to know pretty well, at the Heritage Foundation and who worked on me...with me on the 'ALIC' task force for children and family services. He state in his book on agenda for the states, the average State Legislator confronting welfare problems is like a man lost in a jungle without a guide map or compass. The State Legislator cannot find out which welfare programs are operating in the state. How much money is spent, or actual value benefits given to the recipients. Sometimes the data available is incomplete. He says that the lack of even rudimentary data on welfare spending and program effectiveness after 25 years and to the war on poverty, is a problem and he says, that the first step in designing new welfare policies must be to obtain accurate information about the existing welfare system. All this Resolution does is ask the economic and fiscal commission to contract

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

out for the study of benefits, welfare benefits by families receiving aid to families with dependent children. have...I have been promoting this here in Illinois and have worked extensively with the Department of Public Aid. They are currently during part this study, public law, 88-412, et cetera, et cetera. states that the Illinois Department may conduct a study of the benefits received by families receiving aid under Article IV of the Code. And they are doing, and they are in the process of doing that now. The Economic and Fiscal Commission is going to pick the...this is a comprehensive study so it's broader than just the Department of Public Aid and AFDC..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hartke, do you have any questions on this Resolution? Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hartke: "Representative Pedersen, have you ask...I thought I understood you that you have introduced idea for several years. How many years have you introduced this Legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar #4, is being distributed.

Representative Pedersen, can answer his question, Sir?"

Pedersen: "I think we may go back four years."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes, and this Resolution has been defeated four time already?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Well, it was never really called."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I think I heard you say that you wanted to contract, allow the Economic and Fiscal Commission to

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

contract out for this study. Is that right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "The part of the study that the Department of Public

Aid isn't doing. And they have agreed to do that...happy
to do it. They done a little preliminary work on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, that's enough to make me make up my mind. I'm opposed to this House Joint Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "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. The Gentleman, Representative Pedersen, moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 21. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. 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 79 'aye', 29 'no', and the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 21. HJR 22. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #22, requires Economic Fiscal Commission to submit to the General Assembly, each year a report detailing all federal, state and local programs providing assistance to low income persons in the state."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All House Joint Resolution 22, does is ask the Fiscal Commission to collect the amount of spending done on all the various forms of welfare and assistance in the state at all levels and it's just more less the job of collecting information. So, that have the same kind of

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

information in order for us to address, revising and coming up with new solutions in welfare. It's a part of the data base that we're trying to collect and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Ryder in the Chair. You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion?

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "You know, it took me to get you in the Chair, Sir to get recognize and It's a pleasure to have you there. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryder: "I'm sorry, Representative, the Chair make an error. There was no one else seeking recognition. I had no choice."

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

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen, indicates that he will yield to your questions, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative...thank you. Is House
Amendment 4, still on this Bill?"

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "It's not a Bill, it's a Resolution. There are no Amendments."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, have you filed the appropriate fiscal notes?"

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "We have one if you want it, but it was never requested."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "I have a note in my file that there is about 30 lobbyists, 30 very important groups, some of which donate to your campaign who are opposed to this Resolution. Would you have any idea why?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."

- Pedersen: "I don't know of anybody that's opposed to it. I have...we have talked extensively with the people in Public Aid for several years and we've pretty much worked out the particulars and they have withdrawn any of their concerns. And as I mentioned, they're cooperating on the benefit level, part of it and doing that voluntary."
- Speaker Ryder: "Were you concluded, Representative Pedersen?

  Okay. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, Representative, I may have been looking at the wrong file when we were debating this and I'm not sure I have the Resolution, come to think of it. So, I'm going to have to just ask you some questions because I don't have the file. I hope that's all right. Does this have anything to do with 'sambonia's'..."
- Speaker Ryder: "Representative Lang, would you care to repeat that. I thought that you sneezed. I'm sorry, Sir."
- Lang: "That's funny, Sir. It's only funny because I'm tired but it's sort of funny. Representative, does this have anything to do with 'sambonia's'. I recall that earlier in the Session you had a Bill that would allow 14 year old girls to drive 'sambonia's' at the United Center and you know, how we sneak these things in after they lose and some of us are concerned that you put this in a study regarding low income assistance."
- Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."
- Pedersen: "Well, I was at the United Center and of course, that had nothing to do with that Bill and if you will recall, I did ask the driver of the 'sambonia', if you were representing their union and he still hasn't gotten back to me on that."
- Speaker Ryder: "Representative 'Sambonia'. Representative Lang."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Lang: "Thank you. The person at the board didn't know Representative 'Sanbonia' was. Let me ask you this, this is even more important. We've been looking for something else that was like sneaked into one of these. Can any of these people in the study group be a limousine driver from the City of Chicago?"

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Well, they're probably both...they're probably both, they...what do they say, they double in brass or some such thing. They drive limousines and 'sambonia's'. But I think they probably have to get your permission and I know that you don't want any competition from 14 year old girls."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Lang, you have one minute
thirteen."

Lang: "Thank you. Well, I'm not the one that you have to worry about with the 14 year old girls. Anyway, Representative, the reason that I ask this is because of Representative Mulligans is fortunate enough before the whistle blows here to pass her Bill. There will be a lot of limo drivers in Chicago who have low income and they will certainly need assistance and I thought maybe they should be on the board to study that. Are they part of your board, Sir?"

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Well, if you're talking about women drivers that a subject I would just assume avoid."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I...I don't know what to say. You've insulted all the women in my district. There seems to be insurrection on the Republican side. Are there some rules that prohibit this, Sir? We're shocked and appalled on this side of the aisle."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- Speaker Ryder: "You're also at ten seconds."
- Lang: "I have no more questions. What an insulting thing to the process."
- Speaker Ryder: "Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, do you know what day it is today? We have been here 12 hours and it is time for us to go home. It is 9:00 p.m., we've been here since 9:00 a.m., and it is time to adjourn. We have completed the business of the state and it is time for us to close the curtain and the time with our families. Some of us love our families and want to be with our families. Some of us miss our families. We really love them and want to be with them. I move to adjourn this General Assembly."
- Speaker Ryder: "Representative, you were not recognized for that purpose. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the Chair recognizes Representative Pedersen to close."
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we have covered the subject. These are good initiatives and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Ryder: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Gentleman (sic question) is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 22 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution there are 99 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. This Resolution having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pugh."
- Pugh: "Mr. Speaker, there is a Motion on the Floor.
  Representative, moved to adjourned."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "She wasn't recognized for that purpose, Representative. Senate Bill 1140."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1140, First Conference Committee

Report has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will speak as fast as I can.

This is a Conference Committee Report. I would ask that it be adopted. It does four things, it creates the Inner Agency Council on Homeless Youth, which was requested by the Illinois Coalition to End Homelessness. It was originally Senate Bill 420. It also makes harassment of a guardian ad litem of representative for the child is the same as harassment of a juror or a witness. And it also...that was a Bill of Representative Cross's HB 1030. It also addresses the Baby Jane case with a Klingler Amendment to this Bill. And also addresses notice of pending adoption to the punitive father which was the Turner Amendment to this Bill. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Dart: "Thank you. Representative, in regards to the portion dealing with the Baby Jane changes in the law. Will these changes be...will they in any way impact the Baby Jane case itself, which is pending right now or is this retroactive or not?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "This...the Bill says that the law is applicable to all pending cases."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Lindner: "On or after its effective date so that would be once

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

the Governor signs it and I don't know the status of the Baby Jane case."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Did the rest of the provisions in this Bill...it had changes done to them with consultation with the CBA? The Bill...in the Conference Committee, in it's present form, is this language all agreed to by the CBA?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, it is. We work very closely with the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois State Bar Association and all the language that is in this Amendment and it was approved by them."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "I agree with those provisions of the Bill...the one provision that I had a little bit of concern with was the one that creates the Inner Agency Council on Homeless Youth. Can you explain to me why this is necessary?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, Representative. Right now there are 25,000 homeless teens in Illinois, in all regions and most of the community based groups work and serve them in complete isolation. They...and so this would create a council that would work together on these issues and also help these teens to gain federal funds. And state agencies have no official means now of coordinating these services."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well doesn't DCFS do this right now?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "They do not have this inner agency council, no."

Speaker Ryder: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. Well, they don't have the council but aren't they suppose to deal with...with homeless youths, with

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

youths who are abandoned by their parents, wards of the state who are wandering the street. Is that not their duty now? I mean unless they've rewritten their mandate in the recent Budget Bill which none of us had a chance to really read too well. I'm rather confident that that's one of the duties that they're suppose to be doing now. Is this something that they have just not been doing, they've overlooked and we have to give them a mandate to do this, is that it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "I don't know because I don't know what the present program is. But all the agencies were very excited about this and saw it as a way to try and help teens, homeless teens, throughout the state."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lindner."

Dart: "Well, I'm just trying to get after whether or not this is...I agree with what your inner agency council talking about but the reality of the situation is, I think under the current law this is something that DCFS not only can do but should be doing. There is no way...do they not have any initiatives whatsoever for homeless youths right now?"

Lindner: "DCFS will be part of this, as well as a number of other agencies, DASA, DCCA, DPA and the State Board of Education. So, I think right now that maybe DCFS does not have the capability of coordinating all those agencies to work on it. So although they may be working on it themselves, they need...they want the cooperation of all the other agencies also."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, it's my understanding they already have agencies or councils to deal with this specific problem. Why is it

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

to wait for that?"

- Speaker Daniels: "It wasn't inadvertent, Sir. We are waiting for the Senate to act on 803, it was not inadvertent. Okay, so your second one is answered, as to your first one, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend Rule 84(b) and reference Rule 717(d), ask that the rule be suspended by majority vote of those...of the House and waive the hour of posting requirement for this Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This takes 60 votes, 60 votes. Okay, have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 64 'ayes', 46 'no' and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Cross. On the Gentleman's Motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1. Is there discussion? Representative Granberg. Conference Committee Report #2. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, apparently you didn't hear us but I'm
   requesting a verification, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "No, Sir, I didn't. I did not hear you, Sir."
- Granberg: "We're requesting a verification if this would receive the requisite number of votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Oh, I'm sorry. That's already been taken. So, do you care to address this Conference Committee Report?"
- Granberg: "On the adoption, I believe it takes 60 votes to adopt the First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "It would take 60 votes to adopt the Second Conference..."
- Granberg: "Second Conference Committee Report."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

Granberg: "If it does receive the requisite 60, we are requesting a verification, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Oh, okay. Absolutely. I wouldn't think of any other way. You're within your rights, Sir. Okay, no further discussion by you, Sir? Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. I'm sorry, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, so much, Mr. Speaker. You're, oh so kind. To the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

"This is yet another example of the DuPage County witch hunt. Once again we're going after O'Hare and Midway because you couldn't get your commission together. Because didn't make any sense. You decided to go after O'Hare and Midway and Meigs through a witch hunt. You are out in search of a scandal. Well, as I mentioned in detail last night, guess what, you don't have to look real far. The scandal is already there, it's in your backyard. You know it's there. Why are we not investigating that scandal at DuPage County Airport. We aren't investigating that. aren't investigating the fact that we have had fiscal notes that were sent out of a zerox machine on to Bills. aren't investigating that either and we're certainly are not investigating the fact that we have investigation going on whatsoever to deal with \$30 million that were giving away by the treasurer. This another example of the arrogance in this chamber that has occurred since the new enlighten chamber took over here. There's no reason for this, you know it and I know it. It's a witch hunt, you know it is. Instead of going after the scandal that we know about, the scandal that the feds

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

are investigating. We are picking Airport Authority an that has been operating rather well, with very little state funding at all. This is something that all of you should be rather proud of. Each and everyone of you on the other side of the aisle has had an opportunity to investigate the scandal that has plague place, namely the Notegate, you turned your back on that. You had an opportunity investigate DuPage Airport. You turned your back on that as well. You've also had an opportunity to investigate the \$30 million give a ways. Don't you think your constituents might be a little bit interested with the \$30 million we're given away. Instead you turned your back on that. This is real interesting. You head people are supposed to be...of some fiscal conservatives yet, here we are giving away money, \$30 million for the hotel, we're giving away and you don't seem to care about it. You don't seem to care the least about it, yet the scandal plague DuPage County Airport, are you going to investigate that. No, not at all. You people have turned your back on some of the greatest scandals to hit this place in a long time. The people are going to remember this, they're going remember that you've decided to spend your time on a witch hunt for airports that seems to be working well, turn your back on millions of dollars that were given away to political connections, road fund money that was given away. The voters are going to remember this, you're a bunch of phoneys and you know it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moved the previous question. All say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Representative Cross to close. Representative Cross. The

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2. Conference Report #2, to Senate Bill 1039. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question, there are 62 'ayes', 48 'no', none voting 'present' and the Gentleman, Representative Granberg asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

- Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives not voting. Capparelli.
  Frias. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Klingler. Laurino, and
  Murphy, Harold."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Would you Poll the Affirmative Roll."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives voting in the affirmative 1039, Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill #2. Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross. Deuchler. Durkin, Hanrahan. Hassert. Hoeft. Tim Johnson. Tom Johnson. John Jones. Krause. Lachner. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Andrea Moore. Rosemary Maureen Murphy. Myers. Noland. Jack O'Connor. Mulligan. Pankau. Terrv Parke, from Hoffman Estates. Pedersen. Vince Persico, from Glen Ellen. Poe. Peter Roskam, from Wheaton. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Steve Spangler. Ron Stephens. John Turner. Tenhouse. Ron Wait. Mike Weaver. Larry Wennlund. Rick Winkel. Dave Winters. David Wirsing. Zabrocki. Zickus. And Speaker Daniels, of the Illinois House of Representative from Elmhurst in DuPage County."

Daniels: "Questions of the affirmative roll. Mr. Granberg."

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Granberg: "Parliamentary inquiry. I'm sorry, inquiry of the Speaker. It's my understanding the Senate is now adjourned and we're doing a verification."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Granberg: "Has the Senate adjourned?"

Speaker Daniels: "It's my understanding that they have."

Granberg: "I just want to see how efficient each chamber is."

Speaker Daniels: "That's correct, Sir. We're waiting for the Court of Claims Bill as we have been all afternoon."

Granberg: "And why wasn't...why wasn't that in the budget?"

Speaker Daniels: "You ought to ask the Senate."

Speaker Daniels: "She's sitting at her desk."

Granberg: "How is she recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "She's not voting."

Granberg: "Oh, I'm sorry, thank you. Representative Saviano?"

Speaker Daniels: "He's in the chambers. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Wennlund?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wennlund is in the aisle.

Further questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe or Noland, did you say
Noland or McAuliffe."

Granberg: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Daniels: "McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe.

Representative McAuliffe, is the Gentleman here?

Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe, remove the Gentleman from the roll call. Representative McAuliffe is here, restore him to the roll call. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Leitch wanted leave to be verified, Mr.

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. He's got leave. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Sir, I'm just trying to help."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay."

Granberg: "Representative Skinner?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner is waving. Where is he waving? Representative Skinner, the Gentleman in the chamber. Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner, the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded, Sir?"

Clerk McLennand: "He is recorded voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Hanrahan?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hanrahan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative Kevin Hanrahan is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "It was my intention to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "We just wanted you to know that. Just to excite you. Anything further?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded, Representative Hanrahan?"

Clerk McLennand: "Kevin Hanrahan, is recorded as voting in the affirmative on Conference Committee Report #2, to Senate Bill 1039."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him from the roll call. Further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Saviano?"

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

- Speaker Daniels: "He's right...he's right...Representative

  Skinner has returned so return him to the roll call.

  Representative Saviano is right here. Anything further?

  Any further, Sir?"
- Granberg: "If we have nothing further could we do the budget that was missed?"
- Speaker Daniels: "It wasn't missed but we certainly are more than happy to do it. You have no further questions? Nothing further. Senate Bill 1039. This Bill having received 61 'ayes', 48 'noes', none voting 'present', the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1039, and this Bill, having received a Constitution Majority, is hereby declared passed. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk McLennand: "Message from the Senate, by Jim Harry,
  Secretary of the Senate, I am direct to inform the House of
  Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the
  House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the
  following title. House Bill 803, together with Senate
  Amendment #1. Passed the Senate as amended May 26, 1995.
  The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's
  Conference Room. Rules, Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Daniels: "Rules Committee meeting in the Speaker's Conference Room, immediately. House Resolution 50. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Noland."

Noland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the unique challenges facing the land-grand college system at the University of Illinois. The House Agriculture Conservation Committee is inviting the Senate Conservation Committee to join with us to establish a joint study committee along with university

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

personnel and staff. The purpose is to help them draft their mission and meet the challenges of the future."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Any discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. They 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman Representative Noland, moves for the adoption of HR 50. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. 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 104 'ayes', 6 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution #50. Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Speaker, the Black Caucus will be requesting a caucus approximately...for approximately an hour."

Speaker Daniels: "You'll have to request that through your Chairman, Sir. The House will stand at ease till we hear from the Rules Committee. We're at ease. Excuse me, House will convene. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pugh, misspoke. What they really want is a meeting with you, Mr. Speaker. Just them and you, in your office."

Speaker Daniels: "The House will stand at ease."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee Report, pursuant to Rule 84(a),
the Committee on Rules places the following House Bills on
the Order of Concurrence. House Bill 803. The Rules
Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference
Room. Rules immediately, Speaker's Conference Room. Rules
Committee Report, Representative Robert Churchill, from

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

Committee on Rules, reported the following legislative measures have been assigned as follows: Referred to the House Floor, Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 293. And concur, Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 803, has been approved for consideration. Supplemental Calendar #5, is being distributed."

Speaker Biggert: "The House will come to order. The Chair recognizes Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I would like just to take a few moments during this point that we're waiting for the report from Rules Committee. We have one piece of Legislation left, that's 803, which is a Court of Claims To thank every Member of the House for their hard work and cooperation during this last five months. started on January 11, on a task that looked extremely difficult at the beginning. The accomplishments of General Assembly, from debt reduction to a balance budget, to medicaid reform, property tax cap, job creations, education reform, teachers retirement reform, reform. truth and sentencing, boot camps, parental notification, and ethnics reform, to name a few. All stand high in the accomplishments of this General Assembly. As Speaker of the House, I want thank each and everyone of you for your hard work and dedication. Over the last five months we may have had disagreements and we may have had arguments on Legislation, but I know that every Member the House did that with with sincerity and with the view point that they take and pride of legislative accomplishments and achievements. To those of us...those of us on the Republican side of the aisle, we have attempted to look as the Majority in a new spirit and a new cooperation and a new effort in order to attend to problems

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

of the people of the State of Illinois. I want to thank my Members for their hard work and their support. thank, Mr. Madigan, for his efforts and his dedication to the public service process. To all of the staff, on the aisle, we extend our thanks because we know that these many long hours that we have put in, each and everyone of them have put in even longer hours. So, Madam Speaker, I would like to thank, on both the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democrat side of the aisle. those people that often toil without the name recognition and sometimes without the credit for the outstanding work have done for the people of Illinois in making this General Assembly work, and that is the staff's of the Illinois General Assembly on both sides of the aisle. To all of you, when we complete our work shortly, hopefully. the Committee Reports and the documents are distributed to the Floor, on 803. I want once again thank you, hope that each and everyone of you has an outstanding summer. To those of us that are lawyers, we can go back to our law practice, what remains of it. To those of you in other professions, you can go on to those duties, and to those of you that practice at this profession at a full time basis. you can pickup in your district office as where you left off. In closing, I want to note that we did a research on the last time the General Assembly adjourned in the month of May. It was 62 years ago. This is precedent setting and you all deserve a great deal of credit for Because when the people of Illinois changed Constitution on the three-fifths date, to the end of May or the first of June. They expected us to complete our work on time. We started this on January 11, you've all worked extremely hard at deadlines and completing your work and

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

you all deserve a tremendous amount of credit. Whether you agree or you disagree with actions taken in this House, it is a pride and pleasure to serve with each and everyone of you. God bless you all. And I hope you have a outstanding summer. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Biggert: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge,
 is recognized."

Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that this Session has been marred by a great sense of unfairness and injustice. It is now only 9:30 at night and we have until 12:00, some of us have Bills which have not been heard and specifically, I'm referring to House Bill 1363, which would extend Earnfare from a six month program to a 12 month program and also permit those persons on aid to dependent children to enter into self sufficiency contracts. believe that to not take up this Bill is the greatest amount of unfairness, since we as a General Assembly have this time terminated aid to dependent children in two years. And to leave here without а contractual understanding with those who are poor and in need, shows a great sense of injustice and unfairness and I take this matter, if I cannot have justice tonight, I intend to take this matter to the newspaper and to the public and to those who most directly are effected. believe that, that is my duty. I believe that I have treated unfairly. This Session has been marred by...by Notegate, by fixing of files and by not calling on, I never in the 21 years I have served here, been treated so unjustly in reference to the absence of call any kind of Bills that I am interested in. There are more families who are headed by women and who are poor and who are searching for a way out of that, and who want to be educated and who

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

want to work and to want to be gainfully employed and self sufficient. And to leave here...with plenty of time, there is plenty of time without the justice of hearing this Bill is intolerable and I feel it's necessary to for me to speak out as a human being to say, if you deny me, you deny the 91,000 people, I represent, and I'm offended by it."

Speaker Biggert: "The House will stay at ease."

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar #5, House Bill 803. Read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 803, a Motion to concur as been filed and is approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 803. While it is traditional that the House end on the authorization for bonding. That's not going to happen this year, so I believe that we will be ending on this Bill. This is the Bill for the Court of Claims payment of awards and claims decided by court. The total is \$5,251,000, of which \$2,295,000 are GRF. I move adoption...move to concur on the Senate Amendments, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Representative, all this...we just got this just now, all this deals with is the court of claims. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, that's exactly and exclusive all that's

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

within that appropriations Bill. Those claims presented to the court of claims that have been lawfully decided and for which the awards have been made. That's all that's in there."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it's the awards through May 18, 1995.

May 18, 1995."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "And we just forgot this in the original budget?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "No, Sir. It was intentionally placed in a separate Bill.

It was intentionally...I think intentionally delayed by the

Senate so they could get a head start on us to leave. But,

it was intentionally done for a reason, for a Member of the

Senate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Nothing further."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "I yield my time to Representative Lou Lang."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have an alternative here. I can either ask for a verification or call the previous question. So, I'll call the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ryder, moves that the House adopt Senate Amendment #1...concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 803. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

there are 63 'aye', 47 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 803. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay. We have a Death Resolution by Representative Turner. It's on its way down from upstairs. Then I am instructed to advise all of you that there will be a gathering a Bauer's for a post Session discussion and I'm instructed that you're all invited and I'm also instructed that I am paying for it. House Resolution 31. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution #31, offered by Representative Art Turner. Whereas, the House has learned with sorrow the death of Langdon William Patrick, of Chicago, a State Representative. And whereas, Langdon William Patrick was born April 11, 1914, to the late Langhorne Patrick and Ardelia Patrick Simmons in Lynchburn, Virginia, and he moved to Chicago with his family in 1918. And whereas, after attending Douglas School and Wendell Phillips High School, he served in the U.S. Army during World War II. And whereas, Mr. Patrick worked for the Greyhound Bus Lines and the Pullman Company, and his public service career Chicago and Cook County included work as Deputy Clerk of the Municipal Court, Deputy Clerk in the County Clerk's Office, Deputy Bailiff in the County Bailiff's Office, and Maintenance Superintendent for the Chicago Skyway, where he was the first African-American to become a Superintendent. And whereas, Mr. Patrick served as a Member of the Illinois House of Representative during the 78th, 79th, and 81st General Assemblies, having worked for his community as a member of the 29th Ward Democratic Organization since 1954. And whereas, he was a member of Pilgrim Baptist Church, the Old Friends of Greater Chicago, the Boy Scouts Council, the

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

West Side Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the N.A.A.C.P., of which he was a charter member. And whereas, Langdon William Patrick was bappily married to Lillie Mae Smith Patrick for 58 years; he is survived by his wife. Lillie: a brother. Robert Simmons; an aunt, Gaynell Giles; brothers-in-laws. Jeff Bryant, Sr., and Wilbur Campbell: sisters-in-law. Kathryn Simmons, Juania Simmons, and Earline Simmons: and a host of other relatives and friends. And whereas, Langdon William Patrick was a role model, mentor, and inspiration family and friends, and he served his community, state, and nation with dignity and pride. Therefore, be it resolved by the House οf Representatives Eighty-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we express our deep sorrow at the death of a former Member of this Body and a valued colleague, Langdon William Patrick, offer our sincere sympathy to his family, and join his friends in honoring his memory. And be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of this Resolution be presented to the family of Langdon William Patrick."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Let me first start by asking leave that all Members of the Assembly be added to this Resolution. Let me say that, I met Langdon Patrick in 1979, that was after having ran against him in 1977, and during that election in 1977, I never crossed path on the campaign trail against Mr. Patrick and he beat me solidly. At that time I that you could lose an election and not be seen in Cook County. But, Mr. Patrick, was a guy that was well respected in my community. He was a member of the 29th Ward of the Democratic Organization. After first my

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

attempt at this office, in losing to Mr. Patrick, we ran again and upon winning, one of the things that he of and he used to sit back here on the last roll, there are very few Members who are still around who probably knew him but he sat on the last roll underneath the balcony at that time. And when I came into the Assembly and Langdon always had a smile on his face and he said, young man, do you know that I'm going to retire now, it's time for me to enjoy and as you heard in the Resolution, he had a few jobs with the county and the city, in fact, he retired with about three pensions. And he said, it's time for me to just sort of go and enjoy myself and let the young guy take over. said the one thing that you have to remember when your here in this place, is all you have is your word and I think that it's fitting that we end our Session on if that. Langdon was here tonight as a Gentleman. regardless of all the Bills and all the activities have taken place over the last four or five months and regardless how you may feel about those things, Langdon would still leave with a smile and tell everybody to have a good summer. And I'm certain he's enjoying his rest in heaven and I ask again that all Members be added to this roll call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Turner, moves the adoption of House Resolution 31. All Members signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and all Members will be added to the Resolution. The Gentleman, Representative Churchill now moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 1, 1995, at the hour of 12:00 o'clock noon. With Perfunctory Session, October 20, 1995. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. And the House now stands adjourned until Wednesday,

70th Legislative Day

May 26, 1995

November 1, 1995, at the hour of 12:00 o'clock noon. The Speaker, has the authority to declare the official time of adjournment as 9:48 p.m."