

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Crawford: "May we bow our heads and lift our hearts. Most sovereign, everlasting, and omniscient God, Thou hast searched us and know us. You know our downsitting and our uprising. You understand our thoughts from afar off. For You have compassed about our path and our lying down. For You are acquainted with all of our ways. For there is not a word in our mouth that You don't know. There is nothing about us that You don't know. For how many strands of hair that it is upon our head, yet You know that. For how many particles of sand that is lies along the seashore, yet for You know that. Such knowledge is too wonderful for us in our finite mind and finite ways to understand. So I ask that You all knowing God, that You would govern us, our minds, our hearts, our ways, so that at the end of this day and all that's been said and done yet You'll be pleased. This we pray. Amen."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Sharp is excused today."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative Eileen Lyons is excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "Shall take the record. There being 116 people responding to the Attendance Roll Call there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on November 30, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 368, Senate Joint Resolution 74, House Bill 557; to the Order of Concurrence, 'approved for consideration' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Joint Resolution 19. House Bill 1580, House Bill 1581 and House Bill 1598 'approved for consideration' on the Order of Concurrence. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 942, offered by Representative Novak, is assigned to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano, on page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 368. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 368, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 368 is an Amendment which is brought to me by the Department of Professional Regulation as it pertains to audiologists. It's somewhat of a cleanup

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Amendment which has two components. One, it affects the makeup of the Board of Audiologists. They're faced with a problem that needs to be addressed. The second thing is also requested by the Department of Professional Regulation regarding the enforcement language in the Act which would give the Board of Audiologists the... What it does is it takes out the enforcing language out of DPR so the Department of Public Health, who oversees the licensure will be the enforcing agency under the Act. And I would ask that Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 368 be adopted."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, do you know if anybody was in opposition in the Rules Committee or where this Amendment was heard?"

Saviano: "No, there is no opposition. It's a totally Agreed Bill. It's brought to our attention by the audiologist and the Department of Professional Regulation. It's simply some cleanup language that they needed. If you remember, we did the audiologist rewrite and this was some of the... it's really a trailer Amendment to clear some of the problems that the rewrite created."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any notes filed?"

Clerk Bolin: "No notes are pending."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 368, a Bill for an Act concerning contact lenses. Third reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano."

Saviano: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Amendment I just described becomes the Bill. I would ask a favorable vote on Senate Bill 368 as amended. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative O'Brien, please vote. Mr. Brunsvold, please vote. Brunsvold, would Mr. Brunsvold please vote. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. With the new sound system it's easier to hear. Those of us who work the floor box are not sure you adopted the Amendment. Perhaps we just didn't hear you. I know that your throat may be sore. I just want to make sure we've adopted the Amendment. We certainly have no problem with what's going on. But we just didn't hear you say the Amendment had been adopted."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk advises that we adopted the Amendment."

Black: "All right well, I know that your throat is sore and your voice is a softer, gentler tone than often we're used to, so we'll adjust our hearing apparatus over here and pay more attention. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Supplemental Calendar #1 on

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

the Order of Resolutions there appears SJR 74. Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that every year that we go through the process of trying to determine which of the waivers that are presented to us are right and which are not necessarily those that we would like to have. The Senate has sent a group of Resolutions to us and SJR 74 which are allowing various waivers, but disallowing a certain specific number. And I think in just a few minutes I'm going to have the specifics of this in my hand which I would encourage us to trust. Okay, the specifics are that the Medina District #11 is requesting to allow the district to schedule an additional parent teacher conference to count that as one of the 176 days of pupil attendance. Robian District #85 requests to allow a three day... three full day school improvement days to count these days toward the required attendance and North Pekin Marquette Heights District 102 is requesting to change nonresident pupil tuition in an amount less than 110% of its costs in an effort to attract students from neighboring districts. This passed the Senate 58 to 0. I would encourage support from this Body in the same fashion."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt SJR 74. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion the question is, 'Shall SJR 74 be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 103 people voting 'yes', 12 people voting 'no'. And SJR 74 is adopted. For what purpose does Representative Crotty seek recognition?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Crotty: "I ask that the House join with me in wishing Representative Kevin McCarthy a happy birthday. Although he looks as if he's been over the hill for quite some time, he won't be officially, until December 5th. So, we also have a cake that Jim Brosnahan and I have baked, and so we'll have it down here for all of you. Thanks."

Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears HJR 19. Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move concurrence of the Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 19. This Resolution urges the Board of Higher Education to review the dependence on part-time and nontenured-track faculty in Illinois colleges and universities and requires each university and college to provide a report to the Board of Higher Education regarding those matters. And subsequently, such a report would be given to the General Assembly. This particular Amendment would make date appropriate changes. Any date that refers to 1999 would now become the year 2001."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I want to make certain that there is no underlying purpose behind the Resolution other than the study. It is not your intent that at some point the General Assembly mandate, legislate, whatever the word may

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

be, that institutions of higher education rely only on tenured-track professors. I mean, surely you want the university to retain some measure of independence on that. Your Resolution requires and calls for a study. But I want to make sure for purposes of legislative intent, that's all you're after, is the study. And the study may then move you to legislation. I'm not asking you to do any conjecture on legislation you may pursue. But for the purposes of legislative intent on the Resolution, it is simply for the study, not to indicate to them or predispose the universities to say, 'Oh yes, at some point we will hire and work only with tenure-track professors.'

Howard: "You are absolutely correct in your assessment. Thank you."

Black: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke. Mr..."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, why do you want to do the study?"

Howard: "Why do I want this legislation, this Resolution? Because I am concerned about the reliance upon nontenured part-time persons that it seems our universities and community colleges are now involved with. And I would like to be able to have us all look at that issue in order to perhaps at some point in the future decide that maybe we would want to make some suggestions or at least in some kind of way influence that process."

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the Sponsor's response."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen if you could please lower the noise level and give your attention to Mr. Parke and Representative Howard."

Parke: "Thank you. I heard up until the last sentence."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Howard: "Okay. I'm not sure I remember what the last sentence was, but let me just say that I would like this Body to look at the practice that is currently the prevailing manner in which the universities are using nontenured, nonfull-time faculty. We certainly would expect that at some point, there might be some thought given to the importance of full-time persons. We are certainly not trying to say that there is no need to use nontenured persons and nonfull-time persons in some manners. But we certainly hope that the university systems are not going to begin to rely more heavily on those individuals because we understand that our undergraduates need to have a quality education as well."

Parke: "You're saying that... well, but you answered Representative Black's question by saying that you were not going to move towards recommending that you use only full-time faculty for track programs, but you just now said that they wanted to have the proper education that would allude to full-time faculty."

Howard: "I answered Representative Black's question and he has certainly helped me to answer it by saying that my intention at this point in time is only to make certain that there is a study and that's what he asked me. He also said and I agree that, who knows what might happen down the line? At this point we just want the General Assembly to look at the current situation. And who knows what might happen as far as legislation at some point in the future? And that's the way I answered him."

Parke: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. I'm gonna oppose this Resolution. This is way open-ended. We have in Labor and Commerce Committee a legislation to make part-time faculty, part-time teachers' aids and full-time



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

benefits and I'm very concerned that the cost of public education will rise considerably. So, I would oppose this and I would ask those Members who are concerned about the cost of higher education to send a message to the Senate and oppose this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Howard to close."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would remind Representative Parke and others that this legislation, in fact, has passed out of this Body and has, in fact, passed through the Senate. It is coming back now just for the purposes of changing dates and making dates appropriate. I would urge my colleagues in this Body to vote 'yes' on this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. This will require 60 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this questions, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears House Bill 1580. Mr. Black. Mr. Black on Senate Bill 1580. Mr. Black, it's a House Bill."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 1581. The Chair recognizes Mr. Harold Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We move to nonconcur with House Bill 1581."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 1598. Mr. Harold Murphy."

Murphy: "I move to nonconcur with House Bill 1598."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. Clerk for an announcement."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 18(g) I move for unanimous consent of the House to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration and advance Senate Bill 1867 to Second Reading, Standard Debate. And pursuant to Rule 49, I'm joined by 5 Members of my side of the aisle to request a record vote on the Motion to discharge."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tenhouse, the Lady has objected to your Motion which requires unanimous consent and therefore the ruling of the Chair is that your Motion is out of order. Mr. Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Speaker, since you've denied our Motions that are in full accordance with House Rules, we respectfully ask for a record vote on a Motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair, pursuant to House Rule 57(a) and ask for a record vote under the right to do so as a Body in Rule 49."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?'"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

If you wish to support the Chair you vote 'yes'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 59 'ayes', and 55 'noes'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. And the Chair is sustained. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to request a recount and a definitive answer on the 'dimpled chads' on that roll call, if I could. Are there any lawyers left in Illinois that could help us or are they all in Florida?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on November 30, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1975."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1975. Mr. Black. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1975, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a simple Amendment to a Bill that Representative Black brought to our House Judiciary Committee yesterday. The underlying Bill has to do with authorizing the Attorney General to designate counsel and pay reasonable and appropriate fees of outside counsel who are handling some of these claims in Representative Black and other areas

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

that have to do with federal land patents. House Amendment #2 just tightens up the Bill by requiring that the hourly rate for legal fees should not exceed the maximum hourly rate that's paid to special assistant Attorneys General, that the total amount that could be reimbursed under this section is \$100 thousand and that it has to come out of the contractual services line item of the Attorney General and that the Attorney General will prepare a detailed written report to the General Assembly by April 15th, the year 2001. And again Representative Black and the Attorney General have reviewed this Amendment. They have agreed to it and I ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Mr. Black, did you wish to speak?"

Black: "All right. I just would... I appreciate the cooperation Representative Hamos extended to me in committee yesterday. The work of Democrat staff, House staff, House Republican staff and the Members of the Judiciary I Committee for allowing this to move forward. I stand in support of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Erwin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Erwin: "Representative Hamos, I'm somewhat familiar with what is going on with the Indian tribe's claim. I've a question though in terms of the precedents we're setting here. I mean, it would seem to me if we put who this is aside, for a moment, and think about all of our districts where municipalities have eminent domain rights, where developers want to do one thing or another or any units of government do claims on property, can all of our constituents then

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

come to the Attorney General to ask that the State of Illinois pay their legal bills as well?"

Hamos: "Representative Erwin, I have, actually, some of the very same concerns. However, the Bill was presented to our committee as an issue that is of deep concern to one part of our state and without evaluating the merits of this Bill, my goal was really to tighten it up, to make sure that the legal fees portion did not get out of hand and that we could keep and maintain some limits, I guess, on that. I would really defer to Representative Black who has been working with the Attorney General to really respond to the merits to the underlying Bill."

Erwin: "Well, I appreciate that answer and I don't mean to, at this late date, I'm not on the committee, but I will tell you that I do think if we look around the rest of the United States for a state who have very lengthy, very complicated legal issues, where communities do that involve the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Department of Interior, I am afraid that we may be setting here a very bad precedence (sic-precedent) in terms of a claim on state funds. In Michigan and Wisconsin and Minnesota, those states are not paying the legal bills for communities. Actually, communities deal themselves with it and vis-a-vis the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. So it is not without sympathy and understanding, let me say, I am sympathetic, but I do think this is a very bad precedence (sic-precedent). I am afraid that for the rest of our constituents who have... may feel that their property rights are somehow being infringed upon when the Illinois Department of Transportation uses eminent domain to take part of their property, when municipalities and cable companies and Ameritech use eminent domain. Why is

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

it that those constituents in those communities may not be able to file a claim with the State of Illinois and ask that their own legal bills be paid for? So I, again, I am sympathetic, but I believe that this is a bad precedence (sic-precedent)."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, did you wish to respond? Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Erwin, always... as always raises a very valid point. And let me respond to that point specifically and to address any concerns that any of you have. If I thought this Bill was crafted in a way that Representative Erwin has told you could then be used by me or someone else in a eminent domain suit, I wouldn't bring it to you today. Let me tell you why we are not establishing such a precedent. The Miami v. Walden, and other case, affects state sovereignty over the disputed land in 15 counties of East Central Illinois. Under Federal Law, if a federally recognized Indian tribe establishes a reservation on any or all or part of this land, then the state laws do not operate on that reservation any more. The tribe, under these circumstances, would have the right to set up its own government, its own courts and enact its own laws exactly like a state does. Therefore, I submit to you the state has a powerful interest in this case. But let me assure Representative Erwin and others, Senate Bill 1975 is written to delineate cases only in which state sovereignty is threatened and apply only to those cases. This law would not apply to any standard land litigation anywhere in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, Representative Black. I

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

appreciate that clarification. But let me point out, if I can, I wasn't so much fearing that this precedence (sic-precedent) would be used in other instances, but that, in fact, the rest of the 12 million people in the State of Illinois might feel that they also should have similar claims. So finally, let me also just point out that while I appreciate this is going on in Central Illinois, if in a month or two or a year, there are Indian tribes, and yes, you're right, they are sovereign nations. That's been granted by the Federal Government. If there are 25 claims like this going on around the state, my understanding now is that the State of Illinois will be unlike Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, in the State of Illinois the State Treasury is going to pay for all of the legal bills for any community, be it Freeport, anywhere, everywhere in the state that we are always going to have to pay those legal bills. This is the precedence (sic-precedent) that, I think, does not happen to be a good one. And it is not, I would argue to you, what other states' treasuries are paying for. So, again, I am sympathetic, but I do... I think it's a bad precedence (sic-precedent)."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Will the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative Black, I talked to you yesterday about this a little bit. Is there anything in this Bill that, in fact, would prohibit these attorneys who now the state is going to be paying, from entering into any sorts of settlement agreements whereby they might agree to give a certain portion of land up for sovereignty, which in turn, would invite a casino in and where they can settle this case without coming back here to the General Assembly?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Black: "Representative, I'll be glad to answer your question. I think Representative Hamos' Amendment makes certain that that won't happen, but we haven't adopted the Amendment yet. And you're asking the question as to the Bill and I think that the Amendment certainly strengthens any concern that you may have on that issue."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak. Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Is Floor Amendment #2 on our systems? All I can find is Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, did you hear that inquiry? We'll come back to Mr. Novak. Mr. Hartke?"

Hartke: "Yes, I would just like to comment just a little bit about the question Representative Ervin (sic-Erwin) had on this issue on precedent setting. I do believe that it behooves us to go ahead with this Amendment, pass this legislation. If there is a confusion on defense of the litigation and we should happen to lose, that certainly would set a precedent where more groups maybe would file because they won. It would also set a precedent if we did win this suit and the litigation were defeated. You understand? And I think we're darned if we do and darned if we don't, but I think that considering that this suit just named 15 individual landowners, one in each of the 15 counties, one of those properties could have been properties owned by the State of Illinois. It could have been an IDOT building, it could have been the University of Illinois and in that case, then we would have been involved. When you look at the tremendous impact that this could have, should this case be lost, a precedent will be set that will be hard to overcome. So let's shut the door



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

before the horse is out and let's go ahead with this Amendment. I think it'll be a very cheap price to pay. A penny saved, in this instance, is a dollar earned so... or a dollar spent is a million saved. So let's go ahead with this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak, did you have your question answered?  
Mr. Novak. "

Novak: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask a question of Mr. Black, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black yields. Mr. Black. Mr. Black. Mr. Black, there's a question."

Novak: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, Sir."

Novak: "The guy with the nice gold tie."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Novak: "Yes. Mr. Black, I was just advised by our technical review person that the Hamos Amendment, the latest one is not on the system. But, it does include a cap, is that correct?"

Black: "Yes, it does."

Novak: "And the cap is how much?"

Black: "A hundred thousand dollars, I believe. Representative Hamos has said that the private attorney, involved in this current case, could receive no more than \$100 thousand and furthermore, this entire piece of legislation sunsets July 1, 2001. I would like to address that in my summation of the Bill."

Novak: "Okay."

Black: "But I think her Amendment certainly makes this Bill more palatable to many people in the chamber and I appreciate her efforts on this."

Novak: "Absolutely, because when it came from the Senate there

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

wasn't any cap, was there?"

Black: "Yes, that's right."

Novak: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Silva."

Silva: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question. Why is the AG going to take on the cases, period? Why are we bearing the cost?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Representative, this is a very complex legal issue and again, this is not to the Amendment, but let me try to answer your question as best I can. This lawsuit... the Attorney General has asked the Federal Court to intervene on behalf of the landowners and the state. The Federal Court Judge has not ruled on that issue. There is a question that if the State of Illinois, through the Attorney General, is allowed to intervene, then we may surrender our state sovereignty over all of the land in question. If that ruling comes down from the Federal Court, it may very well be that the Attorney General because of the risk will not be able to offer any legal assistance to the impacted landowners. There are only 15 named landowners in this lawsuit. No municipality, no county, no state. This is a very shrewd lawsuit filed by very good attorneys."

Silva: "Let me ask you this. I'm not a lawyer, but..."

Black: "Neither am I."

Silva: "I just want to understand clearly. You're talking about current landowners, is that correct?"

Black: "That is correct."

Silva: "And the people that have filed the lawsuit are indigenous people, is that correct?"

Black: "I would assume. I mean they ..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Silva: "Who were, I presume, former owners of the land."

Black: "They... That's the issue of the lawsuit. They claim that the land taken from them by Federal Treaty, before we were a state, was taken by them under... I don't know what... a legal term, false pretenses or whatever. So they are questioning, the Miami Indian tribe is questioning the passing of the federal land patents which were then granted to individuals and upon becoming a state then were granted title to the land by state or government fiat, ad infinitum, for the last 200 years. So the essence of the suit is the tribe is saying the Federal Government violated their rights by these federal land patents, therefore, the ownership of all the land in question in the suit still belongs to the tribe."

Silva: "I guess the other question that I had is anywhere in this Bill does it look... will the AG, for example, take a look at possibly renumeration (sic-remunerating) the Miami Indians for any losses of their land?"

Black: "Well, I think the ultimate legal question here is if the courts rule in favor of the tribe, first of all, any renumeration (sic-remuneration) would have to be approved by the General Assembly because that would be an appropriation. But I think the ultimate legal question is, should this claim be ruled valid by the Federal Courts is it, in fact, an obligation of the Federal Government, who the tribe alleges took the land under some other pretense or should the renumeration (sic-remuneration) be appropriated from state tax sources? That is the ultimate legal question at stake here as I understand it."

Silva: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? There being no further discussion... Recognizes Representative Hamos."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Hamos: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I am recommending that we approve this Amendment to this Bill, although the questions that were raised today were many of the same questions that some of us in Judiciary Committee did have. This Amendment to the Bill tries to contain this whole program and we did that a couple of different ways. We did that based on the hourly fees that the attorneys could charge. We did that by capping the entire amount that could be used for this purpose to a hundred thousand dollars. And we did that by requiring a report from the Attorney General by April 15. And we did that by sunseting the entire law on July 1, 2001. So we do recognize that there are some outstanding questions here. This will give us the time... this will allow us to take care of the very urgent needs of the people in Representative Black and other peoples' districts while at the same time allow us to evaluate what we are embarking on and what kind of program we have entered into. So I do urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1975, a Bill for an Act concerning land claims. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be glad to answer any questions you have. We've gotten a fairly good picture of what this Bill does in the debate on the Amendment. Again, I thank Representative Hamos, I thank House Counsel Bob Uhe for his cooperation, the Speaker, House Republican

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

staff for their extra and effort... work and effort on this and the Office of the Attorney General and Governor. This is a classic example, and yes, bipartisanship can and still exists in this chamber on more occasions than sometimes I am ready to admit. But I appreciate the cooperation of all concerned. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very unique lawsuit, filed by a very, obviously, an outstanding law firm. The only named defendants are 15 landowners, no municipalities, no counties and not the State of Illinois and it traces back land patents prior to us even becoming a state. Nine of these 15 landowners have no title insurance of any kind. They... the named defendant is an old... excuse me, that's not correct, politically or otherwise, an elderly gentleman in Champaign is the only named defendant, Rex Walden, et al and others. He is 98 years old. His farm ground has been in his family for generations. The only named defendant in Vermilion County is a gentleman I know personally by the name of Max Call, a former chairman of the Vermilion County board, a prominent Democrat and an outstanding public servant who certainly is not a wealthy individual and cannot afford to defend himself as many of these landowners can... cannot with their own resources. Because there is so much at risk, we have tried to craft a Bill to answer this suit and help the impacted landowners. And let me remind you, this isn't one lot or two lots or a hundred acres, this is 2.6 million acres that cover parts of 15 counties and includes the University of Illinois and Eastern Illinois University. I appreciate the efforts Representative Hamos has made to tighten this up. This is a very unique lawsuit and there are many questions that only will be answered within the confines of the Federal Court. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill and I

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

will be glad to try and answer any questions I can to the best of my ability."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 102 people voting 'yes', 7 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk for an announcement."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Mr. Speaker, my light was on and then off and then on and off. I was a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Let the record reflect that statement. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules to which the following legislative measures were referred, action taken on November 30, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' for Concurrence Motion and Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1582. Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

Speaker Madigan: "Supplemental Calendar #2, there appears House Bill 1582. The Chair recognizes Representative Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1582. This is legislation we earlier saw the rule of 85 which means that adding up

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

years of creditable service and age may mean that state employees could take a earlier retirement than is the law today. You will remember this is part of the contract between AFSCME and the Governor's Office that was signed earlier this year. All this measure does is to codify those terms in the agreement. I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support for the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hartke in the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane County, Representative Hoeft."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates she'll yield."

Hoeft: "This is the identical Bill to what was put through for the conclusion of the negotiations with AFSCME this year."

Currie: "This is only the rule of 85. But that does reflect negotiations between the Illinois Executive and the Employees Union."

Hoeft: "And the Governor and his office is in support of this and would like this..."

Currie: "Yes, otherwise I don't think the Governor would have signed the contract."

Hoeft: "And this is again part of the long-standing negotiations. This is going to be part of the process for us to move along the labor relations that we have had with our unions. This is something that again needs to get done this time. So I would concur with you and urge all of the individuals to uniformly support this so that we can support our workers in the State of Illinois."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates she'll yield."

Bost: "Representative, I understand that this is the AFSCME part and I am in support of that. My concern is are we still going to try to deal with the Teamster issue and try to bring that out. Many of us are concerned about that Bill. If we put this one by itself, if we don't bring that Teamster issue to light and putting them on the alternative formula as well and moving that agreement."

Currie: "Representative, as you remember, we did pass legislation dealing directly with the issue you raised. What the Senate sent back to us today deals only with the issue of the rule of 85. Does that mean there will be no additional pension legislation this Session? I don't know. But I do know this would codify the rule of 85 as negotiated between AFSCME and the Governor's Office."

Bost: "If we do not get that done today, is that something that we can move like the 8th or the 9th when we come back for the other 2 days? Should that be..."

Currie: "We certainly do have 2 additional legislative days in this Session of the General Assembly. But remember we already passed that Bill. If the Senate were inclined to support our work, they have not only today but also those 2 days in January in which to act."

Bost: "Well, and you know, I agree with this piece of legislation. I think we should do everything we can to... and if we... quite often we do combine the Bills so that we can negotiate to try to get more support in the other House and I would think that that would probably be a good way to pursue that."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates she'll yield."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative, now you say this relates to the rule of 85."

Currie: "This is the rule of 85."

Parke: "I thought that was passed last Thursday and sent to the Senate."

Currie: "We had passed another Bill over to the Senate that included, I believe, some provisions beyond the rule of 85. The Senate, dealing with a different Bill number, sent us back one provision and that is the rule of 85 provision."

Parke: "So will this Amendment become the Bill?"

Currie: "This Amendment becomes the Bill."

Parke: "All right. This is the rule of 85. How many people does it affect? What's the estimation on it?"

Currie: "Well, sooner or later it will be available to all state employees. The rule goes into effect beginning, I believe, January 1st, so it will as people age and as their years of service with the state increases..."

Parke: "So, in other words you don't know?"

Currie: "... more and more of them will be eligible."

Parke: "You don't know how many..."

Currie: "How many opt for this program is still a question."

Parke: "Do you know how many are eligible?"

Currie: "Eventually, all state employees."

Parke: "Do you know how many are eligible on July 1, I mean January 1?"

Currie: "As of January 1, I don't have the answer."

Parke: "Is the fiscal... is there a fiscal note on this to tell us what the estimated cost will be?"

Currie: "I have not seen a fiscal note, although I'd imagine you

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

could ask the Bureau of the Budget which helped negotiate the contract. About 280 million, staff believes."

Parke: "So this is going to cost us \$280 million?"

Currie: "Representative, you will remember that that's already what the contract that the Governor signed with AFSCME provides. So this isn't gonna cost any more than the money that the Governor has already committed to when he negotiated and signed the AFSCME contract."

Parke: "But he estimates that this will cost \$285 million."

Currie: "And in fact, let me just correct myself. It may have sounded as if I were saying that this is an increase in state expenditure, it is not, that figure I gave you, the 280 million, reflects the increase in accrued liability to the pension system."

Parke: "It increases the liability to the pension system. And do you know what the immediate... what the first year expense to the system will be?"

Currie: "We don't believe there'll be any increased expenditure until we reach the year 2010."

Parke: "Why is that? I don't understand that."

Currie: "Partly because the system is in such excellent financial shape."

Parke: "What system is in excellent financial state... system?"

Currie: "SERS. The State Employee Retirement System. Remember we have been... we're under a program where we are doing full automatic funding."

Parke: "All right, then let's talk about that. Does the Body know that next year that we must allocate \$1,100,000,000 off the top? Isn't that right? And now we're gonna..."

Currie: "Representative, that would be true with or without this Bill."

Parke: "That is correct. But now you're going to exacerbate that

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

by increasing the cost. Is this gonna be reflected in that formula or is that formula gonna now be moving towards underfunding?"

Currie: "I believe under the legislation adopted several years ago, we will continue to make appropriations off the top to keep the pension systems healthy. But again, if you'd object to this provision, you perhaps should have discussed it with your Governor before he agreed to it in contract negotiations."

Parke: "The Governor did not present this. You presented it. And I'm trying to... let the Body understand that if it's a billion, 100 million and we pass this legislation and there's a cost to the system, do we then have to include a higher appropriation the following year to cover this plan if it's passed?"

Currie: "Not before the year 2010, Representative."

Parke: "Why?"

Currie: "Because the system is in good shape today and because the effect of this change..."

Parke: "Isn't..."

Currie: "Is not going to be sudden and again we don't..."

Parke: "I thought that this SERS system was underfunded."

Currie: "The statutory contribution rates will in fact cover more than the cost of this Bill."

Parke: "But isn't this SERS system underfunded?"

Currie: "So I think there may be a 'red herring' here. We are moving to full funding and we're doing that over a period of years."

Parke: "Yes, but it is underfunded. The fact is that this will exacerbate the problem that we already have. I just want to remind the Body that every year we must increase the payments of the appropriations which means that off the top

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

before any appropriations to any state programs can be made, we have an obligation as a Body to pay our pension systems which we should, absolutely should. And every time that we pass increase pension Bills we are now taking away more money from the state programs of this state. So I'm asking you to make sure when you consider all the pension plans that are gonna be presented, not in just this one, but in the future ones when we come back in January and all of the 92nd General Assembly. We are spending ourselves into a serious problems with our pension system and with our appropriation process. One of these days this state is not gonna have enough money to meet the needs of the citizens and I want all of you to remember the days like this when you vote to increase your pension systems to come up with a pension, with a tax Bill to increase somebody's taxes to pay for these systems that you keep passing here in this General Assembly."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates she will yield."

Black: "Representative, I apologize, I'm sure you've already been asked this question. But it just gets a little noisy in here. This... you are putting this Bill back in the form in which we passed it. That is the rule of 85. No mandatory drug testing is a part of this Bill, correct?"

Currie: "Only the rule of 85 is in this provision. And let me just correct the record. I misspoke and answered Representative Parke's question about the increase in accrued liability. I said 280 million, that was wrong. It's 205 million and that effect won't begin to be felt

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

until the year 2010."

Black: "All right. And for those who are concerned about the zero tolerance policy, correct me if I'm wrong, isn't that in fact a negotiated item in the contract? And it was my understanding that AFSCME agreed that the department could implement a drug testing, zero tolerance policy for correctional officers."

Currie: "I believe it's a three-year program and that is part of the contract but it is not part as a statutory proposition."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "Not part of the Senate Amendment on House Bill 1582."

Black: "Well, and I congratulate you for that. First of all, I don't know that a zero tolerance and pension Bill in the same Bill is a single subject. I don't want to digress into constitutional matters, but it would certainly seem that those two would not be in compliance if someone wanted to file a suit. The only concern I have, Representative, and I know, and I'm sure that you joined with us last spring when we passed House Bill 2869. Had more than a hundred votes. I believe that Bill is currently in the Senate, no action having been taken. That Bill puts the Illinois Department of Transportation workers represented by the Teamsters Union, under the alternative pension formula. And as it was clearly shown last year, the alternative pension formula was designed to better the pension of those who were in jobs that were at greater risk, than say someone in a more sedentary position, an office worker or something. That's not denigrating their position, but it was created to enhance the pension of those who might put their life on the line or at risk in the carrying out of their duties. And in the last 50 years

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

we've had 170 highway maintenance workers killed on the job, 24 state police officers killed, 20 correctional officers killed, only one Secretary of State Police officer killed, none on the Conservation Police, none on the Commerce Commission Police, thank goodness. But the reason that many of us supported this Bill was in fact to say that the highway maintenance workers under the Illinois Department of Transportation as represented by the Teamsters have been trying to negotiate their inclusion in the alternative pension formula for some time. And this Body, this chamber agreed and sent it to the Senate. It appears that they aren't going to act on it. And Representative, I defer to your expertise, if we were to try and add an Amendment at this late date covering the IDOT maintenance workers we probably will run out of time. So I don't think you would stand in opposition to it, but it isn't possible to add to this Bill at this time. Is that... that's a safe assumption, is it not?"

Currie: "Well, Representative, it's hard to hear you, but I believe your question is what happened to the Bill we already passed."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "My answer to the same question when posed by Representative Bost is that that Bill is in the Senate."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "And the Senate has today and it has January 8th and January 9th to act before the end of this General Assembly."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "I encourage him, I encourage you, I encourage all of us to continue to remind our Senate colleagues that this Bill passed our chamber with an overwhelming show of support."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Perhaps it's time for it to have an opportunity to be heard there as well."

Black: "Yes. And I agree with you. And what I was speaking on behalf of some of my Members who were urging me to urge you to accept an Amendment to the Bill that would include the language of 2869. My counsel, and I'll defer to your wisdom, is that we can't at this time. And then it endangers even the AFSCME proposal. I think that's a fair assumption."

Currie: "I think that's absolutely astute analysis. Precisely what we always expect from you, Representative Black. I would concur with your sentiments wholeheartedly."

Black: "Was that astute or a stupid. Whatever."

Currie: "I'll tell you later."

Black: "Thank you. Well, I do thank you for that compliment and I would join you in urging Members on both sides of the aisle. We're on record as supporting House Bill 2869. I think a long overdue piece of legislation that puts the most at-risk worker in the State of Illinois, that being a highway maintenance worker, 170 of those people, men and women, have been killed while performing their duties in the last 50 years while working for IDOT. And if the alternative pension formula was in fact designed to enhance the pension of those in dangerous occupations, I think it's an abominable lack of empathy and compassion on the state's part not to include the most at-risk worker, workers in the State of Illinois in the alternative pension formula. That isn't covered in this Bill, but it is a Bill in the Senate that I join with Majority Leader Currie in urging my colleagues in the Senate, please pass the Bill. Or send it back to us in January in some form so we could at least concur on a long overdue pension provision for workers who

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

have the most dangerous job in State Government. And I thank you, Representative for your answers and thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Skinner: "I wonder if the Lady could again remind us what the unaccrued liability increase will be if this Bill passes?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady will yield. Representative Currie. Mr. Skinner, would you repeat the question?"

Skinner: "What is the unaccrued... the increase in unaccrued liability if this Bill passes?"

Currie: "I believe I answered that question before."

Skinner: "That's why I asked you to answer it again."

Currie: "Currently, \$205 million and currently, the system is funded at 82% of liability."

Skinner: "Okay, we're talking about \$205 million. Ladies and Gentlemen, when this contract was signed, we had a booming stock market. We do not have a booming stock market anymore. At the end of June the State Employees Retirement System had \$9.3 billion in assets. At the end of October it had \$9.1 billion worth of assets. It is much lower now. All you have to do is access your computer to find out where the stock market went in the last two days. This is not the time to be adding more unaccrued liability. Now, as a pensioner starting next month, I can tell you it really doesn't bother me because I know and you know that pensions get paid before any other liability of the State of Illinois. What you're saying, if you vote for this, is that you want to have less opportunity to raise state aid to education or construction bond issues. You'll have less money to spend from the general fund. And if that's the fate you wish, you're welcome to it."



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

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

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to note to the Sponsor, Representative Currie, that I'm in support of this legislation, the rule of 85 and that the Teamsters, who we've had good dialogue on before, are very much in support of this legislation as well, as a part of the same type of negotiated agreement on the rule of 85 that they have in their legislation that we have sitting over in the Senate. So, wanted to make sure we're on the record that all players are on this together."

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

Currie: "I appreciate your votes for this Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1582?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1582. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Hoffman: "Just for purposes of an announcement to the House. One of the House's most eligible bachelors is no more. Tom Dart was married a week ago. We'd like to wish him and his

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

wife, Patricia, all the best."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."

Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet at 3:00 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet at 3:00 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hartke: "Committee Report."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules to which the following measures we're referred, action taken on November 30, 2000, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'to the floor for consideration' Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1284."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Supplemental Calendar #3, there appears House Bill 1284. The Chair recognizes Mr. Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. There's two minutes left, ball's on the 30-yard line, and the State of Illinois is in the possession, and we're out of time-outs. I bring to you today House Bill 1284, very similar to yesterday's Bill, Senate Bill 575. I'm not going to prolong today. As I say it's only two minutes left, but I will be willing to answer any questions that you may have. But I would love to briefly describe the changes in the Bill from yesterday and how they compare with the Bill that you have before you today. Well, one thing for certain the name of the team did not change, they're still the Chicago Bears and they're still a football team. One major change, or one change that I think that's significant is that the Metro East Sports Facility Authority has been taken out of the Bill, so that is no longer included in the Bill. Secondly, in regards to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

the state's concern in their obligations in this legislation, the state actually moves ahead of the city in terms of the surplus funds that are left in the account after the expenses have been met. So, whereas, before the City of Chicago got its share of the funds, and then the state, you know, what was left was distributed, the state will now move up in the pecking order so that it will get its share of funds over the City of Chicago. Thirdly, there has been a change where they've created an advisory board committee. That advisory board will oversee the project in terms of set-aside operations, construction, making certain that things are going along the way they should be. But primarily, this advisory committee will be made up of 12 Members. Three Members selected from each of the four Leaders; the President of the Senate, the Minority Leader in the Senate, the House... the Speaker of the House, and the Minority Leader in the House. The advisory board will meet quarterly and they will monitor the Soldier's (sic-Soldier) Field project. The members of the advisory board will receive no compensation for their services. The advisory board will be dissolved on January 1st, 2004 or nine months after the Bears' first game at the new Soldier's (sic-Soldier) Field Stadium, whichever occurs first. The funding mechanism remains the same as it was yesterday, in other words, the bonds will be repaid through the continuation of the existing hotel/motel tax in the City of Chicago. And all other changes remain the same in the legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have regarding House Bill 1284."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Parke: "Representative, yesterday I asked about season ticket holders and what rights that they had to purchase season tickets for the new stadium. Can you... Have you been able to find out from the Bears what the responsibility of the Bears to the season ticket holders are? What are the options that they have now under this legislation?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, I don't believe that the answer I gave you yesterday... that whole scenario is still the same. In other words, the existing ticket holders will be notified, they will have first choice in terms of choosing those seats. You know, that they will be having a combination of say, season ticket holders and PSLs available and it was my understanding and I don't think there's been any change from this standpoint, that 50% of the seats will be available to the general public, the other 50% will be made available to those ticket holders, no... to, not lifelong ticket holders, but for year round ticket holders and for those who want to buy PSL license."

Parke: "It's my understanding that there's some kind of discount to the season ticket holders? Is that... Can you elaborate about that?"

Turner, A.: "I'm unaware of that, Representative, about discounts. I do know that they will be notified. They will have an opportunity to renew. But in terms of discounts and what the cost is going to be, I have no idea."

Parke: "Now, so in other words, season ticket holders have first option to buy the PSLs? And half of those and half the seats available in the Bears' stadium will not be PSLs? Is that correct?"

Turner, A.: "That's my understanding."

Parke: "And so they have first right on both the PSLs and season

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

tickets that are not PSLs?"

Turner, A.: "That's my understanding."

Parke: "And also it is, from yesterday's conversation, we will not have the state taxpayers of Illinois have any liability to this plan. And is that still correct?"

Turner, A.: "The question you asked is whether or not the taxpayers of Illinois will be liable for any..."

Parke: "To have any liability to the Bears' stadium."

Turner, A.: "And the answer is 'no'. Again, the... in terms of the remuneration (sic-remuneration), the monies that are collected through the hotel/motel tax will be the funds that will pay back the bonds. If there's a shortfall there, then the local... Chicago local distributive funds will make up that shortfall. But in actuality, with the new agreement, the state is actually in a better position today with this Bill than we were with yesterday's version, simply by virtue of being, you know, the reverse order in terms of the distribution of the excess funds."

Parke: "Okay. Yesterday's Bill, also, you stated that even though some of the parking will be underground and tiered underground parking, there still will be... a large portion of the parking will be outdoors where loyal Bears' fans can still tailgate. Is that your understanding then this Bill?"

Turner, A.: "It is my understanding that the tailgate parking facility will still be available, in fact, it looks like it's gonna be on the south end of the stadium. I don't know if you received one of these pictorials..."

Parke: "I have not received anything."

Turner, A.: "... of the new renovation and the park renovation, but it is... it does show that there will be an area for tailgating. And I will make certain, if you're interested,

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

that you can get a copy of it which shows the whole plan, which deals with the 19 acres of park land that will be revitalized and that they're looking at creating terrace parks. There will be hard surfaces for a circus, they'll have trail heads, sledding hills. There'll be a winter garden, there'll be a memorial garden. There'll be a children's natural history garden. There'll be a Veterans' sculpture and water wall there, also. So there are going to be a number of park-related, tourist-related events in that particular area. But the specific answer to your question regarding tailgating, it will still be available and in fact, you will be able to buy the bratwurst from McDonald's for your tailgating party."

Parke: "Well, you want to explain that? I mean, so there'll be other concess... ah, never mind."

Turner, A.: "We want you to travel light as you come into the city."

Parke: "All right. Let me ask you one last question."

Turner, A.: "And besides that, if you buy that bratwurst at the McDonald's down in that area, that'll help us with the financing, too."

Parke: "I'll give that a try. One of the other concerns that was brought out is that the museum, that's right next to Soldier's (sic-Soldier) Field, will be adversely affected during the construction season. What protections have been provided to the loss of revenue to the... I believe, that's the Field Museum?"

Turner, A.: "Natural History... the Field Museum, right."

Parke: "The Natural History Museum. And what protections will be there for the museum?"

Turner, A.: "The Bears have guaranteed that they will make up the loss of concessions and any loss of funds that would come

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

to the park district as a result of the construction and construction-related activities and the renovation of the stadium (sic-stadium) and the creation of the 19 acres. And so, any loss of potential parking and revenues that would come to the museum will be... that shortfall, the Bears have committed to making up for that."

Parke: "Also, one last question. There was a commitment made yesterday, I believe, that wherever the Bears play it will, for the interim, for the season, that they will not be at the stadium while it's under construction, that they will stay in the State of Illinois for those ten games. Is that still your understanding?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, I have no knowledge of where the Bears will be playing or what anticipated stadium they're going to be used. So in all honesty, I can't answer to your question as to where those ten games will be played. Certainly, we hope, that they're very close to Chicago, but whether it's in Chicago or whether they go to South Bend or any other proposed sites that you and I have both read about, I do not know the answer to where those ten games will be played. But we do hope that wherever they play those ten games, that they're winners."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative Turner. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. It sounds to me like a lot of the questions have been answered in regards to the concerns that, at leastwise, the season ticket holders have talked to me about. For those of them that have been loyally been in supporting the Bears, we just hope that the reflection of a new stadium will also reflect in a new winning season for the Chicago Bears."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

support of the Concurrence Motion. I commented yesterday that if there was ever a Bill before us that I thought was a no-brainer, particularly for a big piece of legislation, that was the one. They've now managed to make it even better. So I guess now it's a real no-brainer. This is a Bill that will help provide hundreds of millions of dollars, not only to help the Chicago Bears, which is the least important part of this, but to help the City of Chicago and tourism for all of us in the State of Illinois. This Bill will create thousands of jobs for the hardworking men and women of organized labor and it will bring people to the State of Illinois and to the City of Chicago and the County of Cook. I believe that many who voted 'no' yesterday were simply looking for reasons to vote 'no'. Many of those reasons have now been resolved. It seems to be now that we have a Bill that it's very difficult to vote against. This is a Bill that will cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois zero dollars. Yes, the payment for the bonds comes out of a tax that's already levied, but it is a tax that's already levied. There are no new taxes. The money that's sitting there is usable for this purpose. And now, particularly, that the city is responsible for any underpayments and that the state taxpayers are not holding the bag for any of this, it seems to me that there can't be a person on this floor that can legitimately vote 'no' on this Bill. This was a good Bill yesterday; it's a better Bill today. There is absolutely no reason not to do the right thing. Those of you that like to vote regionally, I think it's time to think about another way to cast your vote. Many of us on this floor still like to pit the City of Chicago against other parts of the state, north against south, rural against urban. This is not the way the



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

General Assembly ought to do its business. We ought to be about the business of finding legislation, determining on its merits, up or down, whether that piece of legislation is good for all of us in the State of Illinois and on that basis, this Bill is a clear winner. I would urge your support of the Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsors yields."

Black: "Representative, the previous speaker said something about no-brainer. Is that what the name of the stadium's going to be? Is that what they've sold the rights to? Is it gonna be No-Brainer Soldier Field? Is that what he's talking about?"

Turner, A.: "Sorry, Representative. Would you repeat the question?"

Black: "Have the Bears decided to sell the naming rights to the stadium, as I understood a previous speaker, it'll be named the No-Brainer Soldier Field Stadium?"

Turner, A.: "Well, I know this, that the one thing they cannot do is take away the name Soldier's (sic-Soldier) Field, so what else they put in front of it or behind it, I'm not certain. But it will always be known as Soldier's (sic-Soldier) Field and that's part of the agreement."

Black: "All right. Let me ask just a few questions and you've answered most of my questions. I still want to go on record as saying it's disingenuous to say that no Illinois taxpayer will have anything involved in this stadium. Now, unless you're renting hotel rooms in Chicago to aliens, I suggest Illinois taxpayers will be paying taxes for the next 30 years to finance this. So let's not get hung up on

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

that, we all know that. I daresay that non-City of Chicago residents will probably pay more in taxes to finance this than Chicago residents, at least on the hotel tax, because probably most Chicagoans don't run down to the Loop or on Michigan Avenue over the weekend to stay in a hotel. Well, be that as it may, I won't beat that dead horse. Should the hotel tax not be sufficient to retire these bonds, it is now my understanding, that the City of Chicago will use income tax revenues given back to the city through the Local Government Distributive Fund which I think they currently cap at 5 million under the initial stadium authority. Now, it's my understanding that the city will use whatever local income tax monies are necessary to meet any cost overruns not paid for by the hotel/motel tax. Am I correct in that assumption?"

Turner, A.: "The city is going to guarantee that the state will get its money back. So whatever shortfall, if there is a shortfall, the city is guaranteeing that the state will get their..."

Black: "Yes."

Turner, A.: "... advance money back."

Black: "And do we have a copy of that guarantee? Is it a contract or... What kind of guarantee is attached to that? Does it appear anywhere in the Bill specifically stating what you told me?"

Turner, A.: "That's what I was looking for, Representative, the exact page, but page 29, I was told. But it has not changed from yesterday other than in terms of the ranking with the excess funds. So the city is guaranteeing the money from its local distributive fund..."

Black: "Okay."

Turner, A.: "... can make up..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Black: "All right."

Turner, A.: " ... for that shortfall."

Black: "And I appreciate that and I think that is, as a previous speaker said, I think that is an attractive feature in this Bill."

Turner, A.: "Representative, I don't know if you have a copy of the Bill, but on the bottom of page 35, it says that 'allocations to the City of Chicago, under this Section, are subject to Section VI of the hotel operators occupation tax which provides that if there is a shortfall of those funds, that the City of Chica... the makeup would come from the city's local distributive fund.'"

Black: "Okay. So that we have no misunderstanding, the City of Chicago's local distributive fund is made up of income taxes paid by residents of the city, then returned to the city by the state under the Local Government Distributive Fund. That's the tax source, correct?"

Turner, A.: "Right."

Black: "Okay. One of the points I've tried to make and if that's what the city wants to do, that's fine with me. But it wasn't two months ago that the school superintendent, who, by the way Paul Vallas, who has done a remarkable job, was looking for almost a billion dollars in bonding to repair, renovate, or replace aging schools in the City of Chicago. Now, you're taking a tax revenue stream that could be used for other purposes and deciding, as the city, deciding to put it into a stadium, which is certainly their right. But that's what they're doing, correct?"

Turner, A.: "It would only go there, if in fact, the hotel/motel tax does not reach the goal necessary for that reimbursement."

Black: "Yes and I understand that. I'm just trying to make a

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

point that sometimes our priorities here seem just a little bit out of whack to me, but that's up to the city. If that's what they choose to do, that's fine with me. Now, let me call your attention to an article that appeared in the November 20th, 2000 edition of Crain's Chicago Business. I won't read the headline because it may be inflammatory to some of you. But part of the article goes on to say, 'McPier on board'. 'In addition to the two and a half,' and I'm quoting from the article, 'in addition to the \$2.5 million annual guarantee and the beautification efforts that McCormick Place visitors would enjoy, Mr. Fawell', the executive director of the Metropolitan Pier Authority, 'sees the Bears' Springfield maneuverings as a dry run for a proposal that he intends to press, possibly as early as next spring: extension of a separate, 2 1/2% hotel tax to fund an \$800 million expansion of McCormick Place, a plan that would add more than 800,000 square feet of convention and exhibit space.' When he refers to a separate 2 1/2% hotel tax, is he talking about a hotel tax on top of the current 14.9%?"

Turner, A.: "Now, Representative, you know, as part of the two-minute drill, I haven't seen him nor have I heard from him. And let me say this, because I'm with you in terms of priorities and where our priorities should be. Now, certainly, the expansion of McCormick Place... one may say that there's a correlation that if you expand McCormick Place you can attract more conventioners, which means that there'll be more people staying in the hotel, which means, in all likelihood, we won't have... the residents of the City of Chicago will not have to pay any shortfalls. So on one hand it sounds good, but I'm like many of the Members here are also concerned about our schools, about

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

prescription drugs, about homelessness and so I think that those are some of the issues that as we come back in the spring, ought to rate one and two if we're talking about any additional expansions. I don't believe you'll be seeing me standing up here talking about those expansions until some of those other issues that we're all concerned with are brought forth and put on the table."

Black: "I compliment you on that answer. I can't remember... I think I heard a similar answer during one of the presidential debates and I don't remember which one responded about fuzzy math. But that's certainly not you."

Turner, A.: "Well, let's just hope we don't..."

Black: "That's certainly not you."

Turner, A.: "... have to do a recount here today."

Black: "Okay. If I misspeak on this, I apologize in advance. I had an opportunity to meet Ted Phillips, for the first time, the other day in conference. And let me just say for the record, I think this is an outstanding, upright, gentleman who answered dozens and dozens of questions with grace and dignity and simplicity. And I appreciate the fact that he came down and spent a great deal of time with the House Republican Caucus and I commend him for doing that. But I did ask him one question. As you know and I know, Soldier Field is built on a landfill, basically, the debris and rubble from the Great Chicago Fire. The question I asked him since he told me the Chicago Bears would be responsible for any cost overruns on the construction, I asked him specifically, 'Have you done test borings on the site... soil borings?' To the best of my recollection, he said they had started but he didn't have the results. My question to him was this, 'If you find that the footings, the piers, the... what currently is the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

foundation of Soldier Field has deteriorated and will necessitate a complete removal or extensive excavation and new footings and new foundation work, which could add tens of millions if not hundreds of millions to the cost, would the Bears, in fact, go forward?' Now, his answer to me and I hope I'm not misquoting him because he truly was a gentleman, that he said to me, 'Representative, if we would find that and we are aware that that might be a concern and we are looking into it, our engineers, et cetera. If we were to find that the foundation and footing and excavation work would, in fact, cost tens or hundreds of millions of dollars, that the Chicago Bears would probably remove themselves from the project.' I hope I haven't misquoted him."

Turner, A.: "All right. Representative, I'm unaware of that and the bottom line is in fact we have been removed for any cost overruns. So if, in effect, there are those projected costs... Let me say this and Mr. Phillips came before our caucus as well and made the presentation. One of the things that we've learned over some of these meetings is that they have spent some \$15 million in predevelopment costs. And I would think that if they spent \$15 million thus far, somebody knows what's underneath the 50-yard line and they know whether or not it'll be able to support... to sustain this renovation. But the long and the short is, through this legislation we have and they have agreed that if, in fact, there are cost overruns, if it costs more than what they projected, they will eat the cost."

Black: "And I would tend to agree with that. However, I also mentioned to him at that time, no one expected and I think people said, that the Loop tunnels would never flood from the Chicago River either, but it did and it cost a lot of

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

money. But hopefully, that won't come to pass. Let me ask you one more question that I'm concerned about and I know you can't give me a definitive answer, but I'm gonna try and put you on the spot anyway. If this project gets underway, not if, I'm a realist I've been here long enough. When this project gets underway, the city finds some unanticipated difficulties with egress, transportation, roads, the moving of water lines, the moving of sewer lines, basic infrastructure. Would it not be a fair assumption for us to think that perhaps IDOT would be asked to use Road Fund money to assist in basic infrastructure of roadways into and out of this new park area?"

Turner, A.: "Well, as you say, Representative, you do want to put me on the spot and trying to avoid that spot, I'm here to tell you that we have no idea, you know. There's been no request in terms of infrastructure needs from the state. It is our assumption, that those matters have been addressed and that everything they need to go is pretty much set. They're just waiting for the whistle to be blown and the guy to say... the referee to say, 'Let's play ball.'"

Black: "All right. My legal counsel objected to my question. He said it calls for speculation on the part of the presenter, so I'll withdraw the question."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Representative."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, if I could or to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been here long enough to know when a railroad train is on the track. I would think by now I would be smart enough to know to get out of the road, but I'm not and I've been run over time and time again. But as I get older it takes longer to heal, I'll tell you that. So this train is on the track

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

and it will pass and it may or may not be a good thing. I'll reserve judgement on that. But what I do rise, I know many of you think I'm just an obstreperous, middle-aged, aging, old man who finds things to raise heck about. But let me tell you and I mean this in all sincerity, I have a deep and abiding passion for the process that we do here and a deep and abiding passion for the people who give me the privilege of coming here and they've given me that privilege eight times in an election. I can't vote for this because I don't like the process. I think it's an abuse of the process. It came out of left field carried by a Hall of Fame, a Hall of Fame bevy of lobbyists and lawyers who told us that the sky is falling, the world would come to an end, civilization would end as we know it, unless we did this deal in the next 72 hours. Don't we ever learn from history here? Don't any of you remember the same story given to us less than two years ago about our wine and liquor distributors? Unless we acted on a Bill, all of the wine and liquor distributors in Illinois would be gobbled up by foreign interests and would disappear and we passed a Bill in the Veto Session, without sufficient public debate and hearing. The Bill was later ruled as in court, in limbo, it's been ruled unconstitutional. We've done this time and time and time again. We rush to judgment. And so the Bears' stadium will pass and the process... you can't ever make me believe nor can the city or the Bears or any of their lobbyists or lawyers. We could have had public hearings in Chicago in December and Springfield in December, a committee meeting in January and you know, if the Bears... the job that they've done and the city have done on this, had we had public meetings, public hearings to let the public know



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

what a PSL is, what the parking arrangements are gonna be, everybody could see the pictorial of what it was gonna look like. There are people on the floor that still haven't seen that. I have a hunch that this Bill would have passed anyway, easily, in January and the process would have been... the integrity of the process certainly would have not been as damaged as I feel it has been in yet another last minute attempt... the sky is falling, you must act today and so we will do that, but look at the litter we leave behind when we leave today. All kinds of unmet human service needs, all kinds of issues, some of which I've sponsored, some of which have been sponsored by you, that will not see the light of day, will not get to debate, will not get to vote, but this takes precedent and literally has violated the integrity of the process and we continually do this and we never seem to learn from past mistakes. It appears to me that this is an outstanding package and could very well have stood on its own feet in public meetings and committee, open discussion and open debate and I think would have passed both Houses. But no, once again, we can't do that. Rush, rush, rush. Vote now. Good heavens, the Bears may leave... the state... Soldier Field may crumble, civilization as we know it may not... may cease to exist, we can't attract free agents, we may never get back to a Super Bowl. Oh, woe is me. So be it. So be it. We have established our priorities for this Veto Session. We are capable of better things, Ladies and Gentlemen. This will pass and the new Soldier Field, I daresay, will come to fruition. It remains to be seen whether I'll have to eat my hat on the 50-yard line or not. We're capable of doing things better in a more organized fashion and in a more reasoned fashion with free and open debate than what

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

this process has been subjected to. We are capable of doing better and I've been here long enough to know. I'll sit down and get run over, once again, by the train. Fine, that's okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to address the press. There is an expert in this subject matter living in the Chicago area, his name is Robert Baade, B-a-a-d-e. He is a professor at Lake Forest College. His phone number's 847-735-5136. I would like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Skinner: "In the... in FY2000, the State of Illinois lost \$1.7 million on the White Sox. That is, the state subsidy of \$5 million was \$1.7 million short of the \$3.3 million that was repaid. In the first year, under your Bill, how much will the State of Illinois lose?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, I'm a little confused because according to the projections on this Bill and dealing with this particular project, the state will not lose any money and that the money will be returned as a result of the receipts from the hotel/motel tax."

Skinner: "Well, we are paying every year. We are appropriating \$5 million to the Illinois Sports Authority. And under the deal that was passed back when I wasn't in the General Assembly, we are supposed to get half of the state repayment. The state repayment, this past year, was \$6.6 million, which meant the state got \$3.3 million for a shortage of \$1.7 million. Are you telling me that the state is gonna be repaid \$5 million, so that the \$5 million will match the \$5 million appropriation each year after this law takes effect?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Turner, A.: "That is the projection. And actually, the state is in a better position on this Bill because we have reprioritized the order in terms of repayment. So the state will get theirs first, versus the city."

Skinner: "Well, that may be your intent. Is it in the law?"

Turner, A.: "Say it again?"

Skinner: "Can you guarantee that this will be a wash? That we'll be better off from a state financial point of view in just looking at the \$5 million state subsidy out, are we gonna get a least \$5 million back?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, we're only operating on the projections and now, who are those people that make those projections? I can't give you their names or phone numbers as you have earlier. But let me say this, that, you know, we're operating on that faith, and as I said, based upon the numbers that we have seen, the state is actually in a better position with the Bill today than the Bill we had yesterday. Now, you know, there are no guarantees in life. I can't, you know, speak for that and you..."

Skinner: "Well, there are certainly could be a guarantee if you wanted there to be a guarantee. I mean, we're short \$1.5... \$1.7 million this year and all I'm asking is... I mean, I'm asking you to give a peg for people to hang their hat on, on a vote on here. If we're gonna be gettin' back more money under this deal than we're gettin' under the White Sox deal, you ought to say so. You oughta be able to guarantee that."

Turner, A.: "Well, that potential is there. I mean, I can't give any guarantees. But as it's written, we're better off on this deal than we were on the White Sox deal, because as I say, in terms of the excess when we go to distribute it the state is in a better position now than they were with the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

White Sox deal."

Skinner: "Well, I'm not sure you're catchin' my question. I do know that the White... the projection under the Bill that exists now, the law that exists now, is that the 6 million was gonna get to 10 million real quick and that we'd be getting the \$5 million back, so it would be a wash. Let me ask another question. What is the state sales tax that the City of Chicago currently received used for? How does the City of Chicago use that money?"

Turner, A.: "I don't know, Representative, that... you know, I'd have to ask a city representative how they utilize those dollars. It's all I can do to keep up with the state money. I have no idea how they're utilizing it at this point. I can't... honestly, I can't answer that question."

Skinner: "Health and welfare of its citizens?"

Turner, A.: "Pardon?"

Skinner: "For the health and welfare of its citizens? For iron fences?"

Turner, A.: "Well, let me say this. You know, again, I can't speak for the city. So I don't know... I mean, I assume that it's spent... if it's spent for the city and as a resident of the city and as you, a potential visitor for the city, we all benefit. But to say, 'Well, it all went for iron fences or it went for health care clinics.' I can't answer that question, but I assume, when it's all said and done, the residents of the City of Chicago do benefit."

Skinner: "It took me five years to get an Illinois flag flying in Comisky Park."

Turner, A.: "It took you five years to what?"

Skinner: "To get an Illinois flag flying next to the Chicago flag in the park... that the White Sox play in. This..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Turner, A.: "Oh, Illinois flag, right."

Skinner: "Is there gonna be an Illinois flag flying, at least as high as the Chicago flag, in the Bears' stadium?"

Turner, A.: "You're saying, will there be a Illinois flag flying as high?"

Skinner: "Yes, I mean, it seems relevant to me that the Bears' stadium would not exist without the State of Illinois. At least you ought to be willing to make the commitment that the State of Illinois flag will fly at the same height as the Chicago flag."

Turner, A.: "I will pass that on, Representative. I think that the Illinois flag oughta be there. In fact, there's a few other flags that probably should be up there, maybe the Super Bowl flag. There's a couple others that I can think of, but yeah, I mean, I concur. But I have no idea, you know and if that's something that you want, there's an advisory committee that's going to be created and I will make that recommendation to the members on the advisory committee that the State of Illinois flag is one of the flags that is flown in the stadium."

Skinner: "All right. Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill. I would like to share the analysis of Dr. Baade. He analyzes stadium deals all over the country. He says this deal is in the mid-range. It's not the worst that he's ever seen; it certainly isn't the best he's ever seen. None of them are good deals. There are three parts to a contract. There's the net rent; we know what that's gonna be, it's \$5.7 million. You have the responsibility for operations and maintenance; the Bears pay zero dollars for that. And you have the responsibility for capital improvements; the Bears pay zero dollars for that. This is offset by income possibilities for the Bears: sky boxes, licensing of seats,

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

sports paraphernalia and such. Dr. Baade, if I'm relaying his analysis correctly, believes that the Bears are going to make more in income than the \$5.7 million. It would seem to me if we were really interested in juicing up the economy of the State of Illinois, in this Bill would be a requirement that the Bears play all of their games that are not in Soldier Field in the State of Illinois. Similarly, instead of going to Wisconsin for their practice fields... their practice days, perhaps they could go to DeKalb. That should be in this Bill, it is not. But let me return to the priority question. This is a Veto Session. I mean, some of us here can go back far enough to remember when we use to call it the Veto Override Session. We have decided to define this Veto Session as the Big Deal Bears' Stadium Bill. There's gonna be no real estate tax relief for the senior citizens, the one-quarter of the senior citizens that didn't get it under what was widely advertised, by virtually every Legislature (sic-Legislator) in this General Assembly, as real estate tax relief, falsely, that was false advertising of course, it was really income tax relief. There's gonna be no gas tax relief, after January 1st and there's gonna be no health insurance availability for those who can't get health insurance elsewhere in the private market. If that's what you want your record to be, leaving this General Assembly, you definitely want to vote 'yes' today, because that's what your record will be."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? I have a question really to establish legislative intent."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Currie: "There's been a lot of talk about minor league baseball teams and other facilities here, there, and everywhere and

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

I just want to clarify the language and the intent of the Legislature (sic-legislation). It's my understanding that what we want to do with this measure is to say that the Sports Facility Authority may now enter into this relationship with Soldier Field and of course, the existing structure Comisky Park. Is there any guarantee that there will not be other facilities or other assistance or other embellishments that the authority might decide to enter into with other facilities in other locations?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, it's my understanding that this legislation is limited to only those two facilities and those two facilities only."

Currie: "So you believe that the language is clearly and carefully drawn so that only two facilities, Soldier Field on the one hand, Comisky Park on the other, are at stake?"

Turner, A.: "That's correct, Representative."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mautino: "Representative, in looking at the language, the two Bills between yesterday and today, if you go to page 29, starting on line 16, that's new language which did not occur in the other Bill. Starts with, 'thereafter, at the beginning of each fiscal year the State Treasurer shall certify to the State Comptroller for all prior fiscal years the cumulative amount of any deficiencies.' Is that the structure in which the funding will be taken from the Chicago local distributive fund and guaranteed?"

Turner, A.: "That is the language, Representative, that now puts the state in a better position than it was yesterday."

Mautino: "Okay. Now, in looking through this, the Comptroller

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

would then have the ability to draw warrants upon the City of Chicago's local distributive fund to pay back any deficiencies?"

Turner, A.: "That's correct."

Mautino: "Okay. And the balance of that would then go to the fund which is established for the Metropolitan Pier Exposition Authority?"

Turner, A.: "That's correct."

Mautino: "Okay. I know that a lot of the other Representatives had asked for questions, I wanted to make sure that was the language which basically takes the liability from the State of Illinois and places it with the City of Chicago."

Turner, A.: "That's correct."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner to close."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Ten seconds left, we're on the ten-yard line and this is the last play. I know that there's been a lot of discussion about this issue and I can concur with Representative Black who's a great friend of mine in terms of talking about the process and yet over a 20-year period here, I realize that there are things that work and there are things that you have to help work. I think that this issue is one that in terms of its merits and what it brings to the City of Chicago and ultimately, to the State of Illinois through the revenues that will be collected, through tourism dollars, far outweigh any deficiencies that we have heard discussed over the last couple days. From a stand... from... As a minority Representative, one of the things that I'm concerned with certainly is employment opportunities and trying to advance the abilities for more people to be involved in the workforce field, in



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

particular, in the construction field. And I think that this Bill and at this time, provides that opportunity for more jobs. There's been a commitment from the authority and from the park district to try to bring in more people, create more opportunities for more businesses and I believe in the long run that we will all benefit from it. In addition, from the park's standpoint, I think that the 19 acres of additional park space that will be brought to flurition (sic-fruition) in this area is going to be an added bonus for us in the City of Chicago. The friends of the park and all the museums have signed off on this and they see this as being a very useful tool in helping them bring more visitors to the museums and to the park and it's for that reason that we rise in support of this legislation. As I mentioned earlier, the version today versus yesterday actually makes... puts the state in a better position. The question of whether Illinois taxpayers or Chicago taxpayers ultimately pay for the financing is a question that reminds me of whether a glass is half full or half empty. There's certainly some truth we will all pay, but I think benefits to the State of Illinois and the benefits to the residents of the City of Chicago far out exceed the liability or the concern that there may not be enough money to make this happen. I believe in the projections and all of the experts and the gurus that have looked at this feel that this is only going to be a bonus for us. And I just ask today that the Members here, in their infinite wisdom, will also see the light and also vote 'yes' for this Bill. And I move for the adoption of House Bill 1284... I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1... Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1284."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1284. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 64 'ayes', 51 'noes'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1284. And this Bill is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 945, offered by Representative Wojcik; House Resolution 946, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 947, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 948, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 949, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 950, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 951, offered by Representative Saviano; House Resolution 952, offered by Representative Scully; House Resolution 953, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 954, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 955, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 956, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 957, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 958, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 959, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Joint Resolution 79 offered by Representative Andrea Moore; and House Resolution 970, offered by Representative Rutherford."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

We have an extremely valued employee has worked for us for 12 years in the Illinois House. He is retiring from the Illinois House to become Representative Tim Johnson or soon to be Congressman Tim Johnson's, Chief of Staff. Would you please offer your congratulations to Jerry Clark, wish him well and give him a great Illinois General Assembly sendoff."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #78, offered by Representative Currie.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 78

RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 30, 2000, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, January 8, 2001, at 2:00 o'clock p.m.; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday, January 8, 2001, at 2:00 o'clock p.m. Adopted by the Senate November 30, 2000."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Adjournment Resolution. Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned until Monday, January 8, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Monday, January 8, 2001 at 2:00 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk and for Mr. Ryder."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. House Bill 4767, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

131st Legislative Day

November 30, 2000

Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 4768, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4769, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act in relation to workplace injuries and diseases. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 77, offered by Representative Black, is assigned to the Rules Committee. Being no further business the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."