80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Timothy Bowman of the Grace Bible Church in Elmhurst. Pastor Boman is the guest of Representative Biggins. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Bowman: "Let us pray. Father, thank You for the men and women who honorably serve here in the House of Representatives. On a very personal level, I ask for Your blessing and compassion on each one of them, and I also ask for that same blessing for each of their families. I that as a new year dawns on this Body that the decisions they make and the directions they take in the coming year will be guided by what is right, and just, and good in Your sight. I also pray that their leadership will be marked by respectful civility and that their legacy of service to their constituencies in this state and ultimately our nation will be one of conviction and compassion, of courage and of character. And may each of them personally, during these trying times, look to You for guidance, comfort, and Finally, we pray today during this time of conflict for our country. Please guide and protect President Bush, Vice President Cheney, their Cabinet, and the Congress of these United States. And we especially pray for the men and women of our armed forces who are risking their lives that we and others might live free. May You truly bless America. In Jesus name, Amen."

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

Hassert - 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

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

- for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Bugielski is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker let the record show today that Representative Black is excused and Representative Mathias, and we also have a new Representative in the chambers, Republican side today, Representative Marquardt."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction to Resolutions. House Resolution 605, offered by Representative May; House Resolution 606, offered by Representative Monique Davis; House Resolution 607, offered by Representative Granberg; and House Joint Resolution 55, offered by Representative Feigenholtz are assigned to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 10, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' to House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 119 and House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1104.
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, again today we have a new Member in our midst replacing former Representative Persico, we have new Representative Roger Marquardt. Roger. Would you like to say hello to the Members?"
- Marquardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be here.

 Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on page 2 of the Calendar, on the

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Order of Senate Bills Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 119. What is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 119 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg, are you prepared to offer this Amendment? Mr. Schoenberg on the Amendment."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 takes one of the four provisions that was in the existing Bill and makes it the sole provision of Senate Bill 119, if amended. This addresses an omission in Federal Law Gramm-Leach-Bliley as to whether a financial institution may not either directly or through any affiliate disclose to a nonaffiliated third party any nonpublic personal information. This relates exclusively to private-label credit programs, such as those credit cards offered by Marshall Fields, Home Depot, Sears, or any other retail This is an initiative of the Illinois Retail merchant. Merchants Association. It was in the Bill previously. this Bill is amended, it will be the only provision of this Bill. And I urge your favorable consideration."

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

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of quick questions. Jeff, did just so we're all clear, the Amendment... this is the only Amendment to the Bill. Is that correct?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct."

Cross: "And the Amendment becomes the Bill?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct."

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

- Cross: "All right. We're not aware on this side of any opposition. Jeff, are you aware of any?"
- Schoenberg: "There is no opposition, that it was registered either today in Committee, or previously, when this was part of the original underlying Bill."

Cross: "All right. Thanks a lot, Jeff."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 119, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg, to present the Bill."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you. As I previously explained, this was in the original underlying Bill. And it relates to the ability of private-label credit programs for retail merchants to be able to interface sufficiently with financial institutions. There is... This is an omission and that it would be corrected by this Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I urge your support."
- Speaker Madigan: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Fritchey voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1104, Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1104 has been read a second time

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke, to present the Amendment. Mr. Burke on the Amendment."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would allow state financial institutions to reveal customer records when the matter involves foreign intelligence or counterintelligence, as defined in Section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 and the USA Patriot Act of 2001. Disclosure permitted to any Federal Law enforcement, intelligence, protective immigration, national defense, or national security official, pursuant to any lawful request in order to assist the recipient in the performance of his or her official duties. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a . . . Maybe an inquiry of the Chair or the Sponsor, is this the only Amendment, Representative?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "I'm sorry, Speaker. I didn't hear his question."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, is this the only Amendment?"

Burke: "This is the only Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, the answer is 'yes', Mr. Cross."

Burke: "Yes."

Cross: "All right. And my understanding again, is somewhat similar to the prior Bill. This Amendment becomes the Bill, Representative. Is that correct?"

Burke: "Yes, yes."

Cross: "All right, thank you very much."

80th Legislative Day January 10, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, in what form are they going to provide the information, written on disk? What are they going to do with that?"

Burke: "Representative, the language of the Bill does not specify in what form information would be conveyed. It just talks about the ability of these federal agencies, to gain the information. I would suspect that there is some standard form that would be used as would be the case in any subpoenaed information, let's say."

Mulligan: "All right, so will they need an official document to go in tha... to get that information? It's just allowing the banks to cooperate with whatever the legal process would be to obtain information."

Burke: "Yes, given very specific circumstances that those circumstances are identified in the language. And we're talking about the condition of our nation today and our concern for terrorist activities and our concern for those who have been engaged in terrorist activities who have financial resources in our banking institutions. That's specific. That is named in this legislation."

Mulligan: "I understand the reason behind it and I agree with the reason. I just want to make sure that the way it is done that individuals who are not in the process of doing anything that's illegal or against the interests of the United States would have their information kept confidential, not released to the wrong authorities, the press, anything like that. And that there would be an official process for how you would do this."

Burke: "That would be my concern, as well. And I think all of

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

are colleagues here would agree that we do not want to just open the doors of these institutions without there being some specific need, something that would involve the nation's protection. So, we're specific in the language and I think your concerns will not be current."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. When this Bill first Came..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks, Mr. Franks, I believe we are on the Amendment."

Franks: "I understand."

Speaker Madigan: "You may want to speak on Third Reading."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Johnson: "Representative, is there any provision in this language that would in fact notify the actual depositor, should his account be looked into? Or is this... do you know?"

Burke: "Representative, the language would insist that pursuant to lawful request, as is current law today. So, I think if there were provisions currently in place in law, that would continue along with this particular need to acquire the information. So, I would have to presume, which is maybe not a good thing to do, that individuals who would have accounts at these institutions would be notified of that information being dispensed."

Johnson: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act concerning

banking. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke, on Third Reading."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. I think the original discussion with respect to this Amendment would address some of the interests and concerns. And I think all of us here understand that this country is faced with very serious issues. The banking institutions have come to the Legislature asking for these provisions. It is... a very serious matter, one that I think that we would all agree is necessary to give our federal authorities the opportunity to identify any illicit funds or dollars that are being used to counter any protections in our security of this country. So, I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration and be able to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I voted for it when it was the Bill. I voted 'present' the last time this was up, Mr. Burke, because of a potential conflict of interest. However, this time I'm going to be voting 'yes' because you've changed the Bill substantially with your Amendment, dealing with necessary information dealing with terrorism. And I think everyone here should vote for this Bill, regardless of any potential conflict of interest. It's that serious of a matter. So, for the first time I'll be switching a vote, on a question of a potential conflict. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no further discussion, the question

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' 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 question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 10, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 & 4 to House Bill 3495 and a House Resolution 605 referred to the Order of Resolutions. Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."
- Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House Resolution 605. Representative May. Representative May. Karen May. House Resolution 605."
- May: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you and Members of the House. This Resolution urges the Federal Communications Commission to grant a permanent waiver on the 11-digit dialing mandate in the 847 area code and to change its policy for affecting all of the overlay area codes. Today, it's 847, tomorrow it is all of Illinois. Every code in the state will be out

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

of phone numbers by 2007, we are told. And I've called the FCC and I've written the FCC and I ask you to add your voices to mine to send this Resolution to them. Half of the numbers are still available in the 847 area code. There was a recent ruling by the FCC listing their long term ban on overlay districts for cellphones and pagers. And this would make a lot of numbers available. My cellphone is 312, although I live in 847. It works. This is a terrible inconvenience for citizens and for businesses. Security systems are need to be programmed at great expense and I urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. There being no discussion, the question is, Mr. Stephens?"

Stephens: "Would the Lady yield for questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "Lady yields."

Stephens: "Representative, what did you say your cellphone number was?"

May: "My... 312. I've had it a long time."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Resolution?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. On the Supplemental Calendar there appears House Bill 3495. The Bill will be presented by Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."

Hannig: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

For the last five years, we've had some unprecedented growth in revenues for our State Government and we've been able to do some important things for education, for social services, and for a number of other agencies. And Governor Ryan and Governor Edgar, before him, were both very cooperative when working with us here in the State

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Legislature in trying to find ways to address the problems that we, as Members of the House and our colleagues in the Senate, felt were important. But unfortunately, we now find ourselves in an era where revenues have not only not grown, but for the first time that I can recall, we've seen six months of negative growth in State Government. Even as we find ourselves faced with declining revenues, we double-digit increases in health care costs, particularly prescription drugs. And these two items have combined to put us, today, in this difficult financial situation and Governor Ryan has asked us to take the difficult step of giving him the tools to manage the state budget. proposal, which has already passed the Senate by a significant vote, would give the Governor the opportunity to reduce general revenue budgets, other than the state aid formula, by up to 5%. Now, in some cases he's made reductions unilaterally; in other cases, he's indicated that he would like to make reductions but because of statutory requirements he does not have that authority. This Bill would give him that authority to make these additional reductions. So, this is not an easy situation for the Governor; it's not an easy situation for those of here in the House, or for our colleagues in the Senate. We all know that we face a financial crisis here in the State of Illinois and the longer we linger without solving it, the worse that it will become. So, I am urging you today to join with me in an effort to put this Bill on the Governor's desk which gives him the authority and the tools that he needs to manage the 2002 budget, so that we can put this budget crisis behind us and start looking to the future and start thinking in terms of a 2003 budget which, frankly, will also be a difficult year. But we cannot, any

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

longer, continue to complain, debate, and propose; it's time for us to take action and this Bill gives the Governor the authority. It takes the action that we need to take to reduce budgets and get the Illinois budget, once again, balanced as it needs to be. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd move that we concur in Senate Amendments #2 and Senate Amendment #4."

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill and to the general process."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Mulligan: "I have some quandaries about this Bill, although earlier in the Veto Session I asked that we allow the Governor to have this kind of authority for the simple reason that the cuts that were being made impacted too much on Human Services. I certainly have a problem with where this Bill was heard this morning because the majority of the cuts were in Human Services and I think they should have been heard in Human Service Appropriation. last several years, in the ten years that I've been here, we have asked for things to be changed. We have asked for individual budget Bills. I, personally, have sponsored through both a Republican and Democrat Comptroller rainy day process. We do not have one that adequately addresses all the issues. I think our total budget system is not fluid enough to address a downturn in the economy. And I'm really concerned, basically, with the process and what we're doing with it. I hope that in the coming General Assembly we will take a look at that process. I feel compelled to support something that I don't think is an adequate way of handling the situation only because it may

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

help across the board a lot of the areas that I work with and represent in Human Services who are taking bad hits. also hope that the Governor, in doing this, will be open to the process of listening to some of the ideas that both Legislators and advocates have about making a different way of either raising money or spending the money that we currently have in order to facilitate less impact to the cuts on the people that we represent. I'm very disappointed at some of the grandstanding by individual groups. No one has talked about reinstating a COLA that we fought long and hard for for the DD community. No one has thought, in good times, for the bad times the way they And I'm really, seriously concerned should have been. about having to do what we're doing now. alternative to it for the current future, but for the distant future we need to have a better process. This is a poor way that we do the budget in this state as far as handling emergencies or even the money in good times. think there are better ways of not making these cuts and finding the money. And I hope the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor will take that in mind and continue to listen to the people and to the Legislators here in the General Assembly. I am certainly not happy about what's happening. We can't do much about the economy, but we could have done something when times were better to facilitate how we spend So, to that end, I will hold my nose and the money. support this, but quite frankly, we have not addressed the process properly and I'm very disappointed in how we're having to do this."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Righter."

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

80th Legislative Day January 10, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Righter: "Representative Hannig, what areas of the general revenue part of the budget and that's all we're... Is that all we're dealing with here in this legislation?"

Hannig: "Yes, general revenue only."

Righter: "Okay. What areas of that part of our treasury will this Bill not affect?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, there's a specific exemption in the Bill for general state aid to schools, so it will not affect that. There are also... You know, and that's prim... I think that's the biggest area that's been set aside. That's billions of dollars."

Righter: "Okay. What about the budget that we passed for the courts? Is that in the general revenue part of our... It is, isn't it?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry. What did you say? The..."

Righter: "The budget for the court system."

Hannig: "Yes, but the court system is not a part of this. It is
 set aside."

Righter: "It is not... it will not be accessible..."

Hannig: "It is not a part of this authority that we're giving to the Governor."

Righter: "Okay. So, any reductions in the fiscal year 2002 budget that the Governor may accomplish through this Bill he would not be able to reach into the court's part. Is that right?"

Hannig: "That is correct. We set aside the courts and the Constitutional Officers: the Secretary of State, the Attorney General. They may will... you know, they may volunteer to participate with us on this, but we felt that because they're elected officials, statewide officials, as far as the constitutionals were concerned are a separate

80th Legislative Day

- January 10, 2002
- branch of government as far as the courts were concerned, that we needed to deal with them on a one-on-one basis. And perhaps we could get them to volunteer some funds, but not compel them."
- Righter: "Now, the Constitutional Officers' budgets, even if they were in this Bill, Representative Hannig, would the Governor be able to unilaterally reduce their appropriation?"
- Hannig: "Representative, I don't know. I think it... that causes some problems and that's why it's not in the Bill."
- Righter: "Okay. But it's fair to say that the General Assembly itself could certainly reduce the appropriation to the court system or to the Constitutional Officers, could it not?"
- Hannig: "I think it's fair that we could. I'm not certain if that that would be a wise thing to do, Representative..."
- Righter: "Okay."
- Hannig: " ... but we could try."
- Righter: "What about the legislative agencies, Representative Hannig? Are they a part of this Bill?"
- Hannig: "The language does not include the legislative agencies, but it's my understanding that the four Leaders have agreed that they will take voluntary cuts."
- Righter: "Okay. Representative Hannig, you made the comment, a little bit earlier, about you weren't sure it would be wise to dip into or for the General Assembly itself to exercise its proper constitutional authority and adjust an appropriation to the Constitutional Officers' budget or the court system. Why would that... Why do you think you're not sure that would be wise?"
- Hannig: "Well, the point I tried to make is that the Constitutional Officers are elected officials that hold

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

statewide offices in the Executive Branch and obviously, the Legislative or the Judicial Branch is a whole separate branch of government. This Bill, which will give the Governor some extraordinary special powers for short-term, for a short time, perhaps it's best that we not extend it beyond the scope of the general revenue agencies and what you would generally call those agencies that are under the Governor's control or close to being under his control."

- Righter: "Yeah. And I don't think I stated my question very well. I'm not asking whether or not... why it wouldn't be wise to give the Governor unilateral authority to reduce those areas of the budget, I'm asking why you think it would be unwise for the General Assembly itself to consider those areas of the budget?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, the... for example, the Judicial Branch of government which is elected, it's its own branch, it needs to be independent of us and the Executive Branch, they have to make decisions and they have a role in government as stated in the Constitution. We do have a, you know, the authority to give them a budget and to make laws, but I'm not certain that it's wise to put them in a difficult... I'm not saying that it's unconstitutional or illegal. I just don't personally think that it would be wise to come back and to put them in a situation where we would take some of their funding away in the middle of a fiscal year."
- Righter: "Well, see, you're suggesting that the Judicial Branch of government wants a budget as passed, should be forever exempt from adjustments, mid-year adjustments?"
- Hannig: "There could be times, Representative... What I'm saying is that this is a special Bill that the Governor... that we're giving the Governor powers to reduce spending and

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

we're trying to limit it to those agencies where we think the most money... where the most money is, which is the Human Service agencies and to some degree, education."

Righter: "Okay."

Hannig: "I don't know that we want to take on a fight with the Judicial Branch of government which, you know, they're an independent branch of government."

Righter: "Well..."

Hannig: "And that's just my opinion. It's not in the Bill."

Righter: "I understand, Representative. And now I want to talk about exactly what's in the Bill. I want to make sure I'm clear. Right now, reimbursements to hospitals that go through Medicaid for inpatient care, that is set forth in statute. Is that right?"

Hannig: "The... I believe that the hospital rates are in rule, that they're set by rule and that the Governor had used his powers to reduce reimbursements to hospitals through emergency rules. Okay. Now, I'm advised, that the DRGs actually are statutory, Representative."

Righter: "I'm so... I didn't hear that."

Hannig: "That you may be correct at some of what's in... what's in this Bill or some of what this Bill would actually be..."

Righter: "In law now. In..."

Hannig: "Yeah. Some of that's in law and that's, for example, with the nursing homes, that's why the Governor could not reduce nursing home rates unilaterally because they were set by statute. So, some reimbursement rates in our... the way the government works in Illinois are set by rule and some are set by statute."

Righter: "Okay. And that's what I want to be clear on. This Bill would take away, in those areas where the

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

reimbursement levels are set forth in statute, would take away the authority, the sole authority the General Assembly has and give it to the Executive Branch of government. Is that right?"

Hannig: "It would suspend, in effect, or give the Governor temporary emergency powers for this fiscal year only, to reduce those... to pay 5% less than those statutory rates. So, if the rate for some reimbursement process was a hundred dollars, the Governor by emergency rule could set it at 95, for this fiscal year only."

Righter: "Okay."

Hannig: "Then it would revert back starting July 1st, to the statute. So, this is a temporary solution."

Righter: "But it's fair to say that this solution would, whether it's temporary or not, would only be required when there's a shortage of money. Is that fair to say?"

Hannig: "Well, yeah. We're here, Representative, because we don't have enough money to pay our bills."

Righter: "So, in a difficult fiscal time, the Members of the General Assembly, all of whom got an opportunity to vote on the budget, all of whom have gotten letters or notes or calls of praise from one segment of society or another because we've passed some programs and spending some money there, all of us have been able to attend a grand opening or a ribbon cutting or something like that. All that... All of us here who have been able to take part in that part of the process now are gonna give away part of that and just to the Governor, in this legislation."

Hannig: "Representative, we've known about this fiscal process for probably at least six weeks. We've known about this fiscal problem for at least six weeks. I have yet to see a Member of this Assembly come forward and say, I've got a

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

\$500 million plan that's better than what the Governor has to reduce spending. We all complain that we don't want to cut this program, we don't want to cut that program, but no one has really come forward with a \$500 million program that they believe that they could vote for and that they could find the consensus in the Senate and here in the House. So, I think, you know, we've had time to do these things if we had shown the backbone and the will, but we simply had not, and the Governor has said it's time to move forward, give me the authority and I'll make the cuts. And so that's where we are today, Representative."

Righter: "Representative Hannig, do you think it's preferable to give the Governor this authority and therefore, surrender the say that the people in this Body have on these issues, or to be willing to allow for a vote a Bill that would reduce the general revenue part of our budget across the board by a percent and a half or two percent exempting areas such as education, but very few areas and spread the pain that way? Do you think that's preferable to this? Would you rather vote on something like that?"

Hannig: "Representative, this is the solution that we have at hand today. It's a solution that will give the Governor the tools that he needs in order to balance this budget. He doesn't want to make these cuts any more than you do or I do, but he's shown a willingness to do it, and we've shown a willingness to work with him. He worked with us when times were good and did a lot of things that we wanted. Now that times are bad, we need to work with the Governor and give him the tools to make this budget work, because if we don't do it today, it's only gonna get worse tomorrow and the day after. And by the year... by the fiscal year 2003, it's gonna be another disaster. So, I'm

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

saying that this is the Bill that we have in front of us today. It's already passed the Senate. The Governor indicates that he can live with it, that it will work for him, and that we need to take action on it now."

Righter: "But Representative Hannig, the reason that this is the only solution that we have in front of us today is because that's the choice that we've made, because that's the choice that the Leaders here in this chamber have made that this is the only Bill... we're not gonna consider anything else. Is that not right? Have there not been statements made by some of the Leaders in this chamber that..."

Hannig: "Representative, we've had meetings..."

Righter: " ... that we won't vote on a Bill other than this?"

Hannig: "We've had meetings in the Bureau of the Budget's Office and Representative Tenhouse has been there and I have been there and we've put ideas on the table to cut this... to cut this program or cut that program, and invariably someone objects. I object on a number of things that I would... I feel that my caucus would never, ever accept and Representative Tenhouse does as well, on your behalf. And when we get that done at the end of the day and we add up there is very little money there that we can agree on. So, I'm not certain that there's... I'm not... You know, it isn't fair to say that we haven't tried to find alternatives, it's just that all four caucuses in all the regions of the State of Illinois have a little bit different idea of what is wasteful government spending and what is much needed government programs. And that's what it boils down to."

Righter: "Representative Hannig, and I asked the question a few moments ago about what's a preferable solution, this or the across the board that I've referred to? And you said, well,

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

this is the only one in front of us and I understand that. What I'm asking from you, Representative, is this what you prefer? Is this the way you'd rather see us do it?"

Hannig: "Representative, I feel that we have to get this problem behind us and this is the solution that we can get to the Governor today. I believe it will work as well as any. you want to ask the Governor to use his 5% power to cut budgets across the board and you can make the case that that makes sense, I think the Governor will listen to you. I believe that Governor Ryan is very open as to how he can find these cuts. I think he would be very happy if we could present him with cuts that no one would object to. So, this does not preclude the Governor from doing what you're suggesting, but it only gets him the power to do it today so that we can move forward on the budget. So, I would suggest maybe you make the argument to the Governor that he do it, that he use this power that we're asking of you to give to him today that he use it in that manner."

Righter: "But that leaves the other areas that I referred to earlier, Representative Hannig, untouched. It leaves them untouched from the problems that we're having now, so that we can lay the burden on nursing homes and I've got calls from nursing home administrators in my district already and I'm gonna call them back and I'm gonna try to explain to them, Representative Hannig, how it is that they're supposed to go back to their banker and ask for an ext... further extension on their line of credit to stay open so that we can make sure and not touch any of the budgets that might belong to the Constitutional Officers or to the courts or anything else like that. That's the question, Representative Hannig. Is... Yes, I... we can all ask the Governor to go across the board and I hope some of us will

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

do that, but that leaves totally untouched from the problems that we're having right now, other areas of the budget that we can control."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think that the Constitutional Officers will be standing for election this fall and they have to make the decision that they think is best for the people of the State of Illinois. So, if the Attorney General or the Secretary of State or the Comptroller want to voluntarily reduce their budget by 2 or 3 percent, they should do that and if they don't..."

Righter: "But who's decision..."

Righter: "Who's decision is it, Representative Hannig, how much money they have to spend? Is that theirs or is it the General Assembly's and the Governor's, together?"

Hannig: "Representative, it's up to them to decide."

Righter: "How much money they have in a fiscal year to spend in their offices?"

Hannig: "They ca..."

Righter: "We decide that, don't we?"

Hannig: "They came with the budget. We, in most cases, were able to get them to reduce that budget to some amount that we all agreed on and we passed it and they have it. But the issue is, we gotta get to the real money, Representative. It's okay to talk about cutting some of these smaller agencies or the Judicial Branch, the real money is in Human Services and the real money's in education. That's where the big money is and that's where most of the cuts will fall."

Righter: "Thank you, Representative Hannig. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

80th Legislative Day January 10, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Righter: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, I understand that this is a very difficult time fiscally for everyone here in the State of Illinois. It's a difficult time for the people in this chamber and the Senate and some tough decisions need to be made. However, as I said in my questioning to Representative Hannig, we all got to vote on the budget. We all get to share some of the credit for the money we're spending. We ought to go to ground breakings and ribbon cuttings and things like that. But then when it's time to make some difficult decisions, we have allowed ourselves to just slip back and say, I don't want to be part of the process. I don't want to have a say in what program gets reduced. And so when we go back to our constituents after this is over and our constituents say, how... what input did you have in this? What impact did you have on how we're gonna balance our books? You say, none, I didn't have any. You tell your hundred thousand people, I didn't because I made a vote to shoulder it all on the Governor. I admire the Governor for his willingness to take this issue on, I truly do. But he shouldn't have to because we're all paid by the taxpayers just like he is and we ought to insist on being bigger players. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Currie: "I have a question for legislative intent. Can you specify exactly which state agencies are subject to the 5% contingency reserve designation?"

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Representative Currie, and that's a very good question. The Bill applies to all Executive

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Branch state agencies that are directly responsible to the The language is derived from Article V, Section Governor. 11 from the Illinois Constitution, which gives the Governor the authority to reorganize by executive order executive agencies that are directly responsible to him. addition, this Bill expressly applies to the State Board of Education except that general state aid funds are not This Bill also applies to all funds that are affected. appropriated through any state agency for higher education Accordingly, for example, this covers funds purposes. appropriated for the benefit of state universities. addition to the above, this Bill is drafted to cover, by way of further example, the following additional agencies, boards or commissions: the State Board of Elections, the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Industrial Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, the Pollution Control Board, and the Department of State Police Merit Board. Now, there are others, but these are mentioned specifically because they are treated differently in the Executive Reorganization Implementation Act where they are exempted from the Governor's power to reorganize by executive order."

Currie: "I, also, am curious that the Legislature itself is not included in this 5% reserve. Can you explain what the Legislature will do or will not do to take its fair share of budgetary pain?"

Hannig: "Again, I believe that the Governor is trying to respect the differences between the Judicial Branch, the Executive Branch, and the Legislative Branch, but the Leaders of the Legislative Branch, our Leaders, have indicated a willingness to voluntarily accept a 5% reduction in their budget. So, Representative, we will, for practical

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

purposes, be a part of this reduction."

- Currie: "I'm glad to hear that. And could you also tell me whether you think there's reason to believe that should the Governor be required to make additional cuts, he will do so in a consultative fashion?"
- Hannig: "Yes. The Governor has advised us that in a very best case example, perhaps, we can get through the fiscal year without a lot of new cuts having to fall, but that should the economy not pan out as well as we thought and he has to face the situation of making additional cuts, that he will consult with the Legislative Leaders and the four legislative caucuses before he makes any additional cuts."
- Currie: "And I assume, too, that there will be some decisions that he could make that might have to be approved by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. Is that a fair statement?"
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative. JCAR does have a role in the whole process of rulemaking."
- Currie: "To the Bill, if I might, Speaker. It's easy to vote against a measure like this. Sure, you're hearing from your advocacy groups at home; nobody likes the idea of cuts. It's always easy to find a reason to vote against anything that's up on this board, but I would suggest to you, my colleagues, that the responsible vote on this measure is a 'yes' vote. Yes, it gives the Governor broad authority, but that authority lasts only until June 30th, this year. In addition, he has committed to working with us and the Legislative Leadership if further cuts are necessary. Most importantly, if revenues continue their precipitous decline in the State of Illinois treasury, we will be faced with additional cuts, and without this authority, the Governor has few places in which to make

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

I was delighted that the Governor was able to reverse his decision to slash rates for safety-net hospitals and rural hospitals. Without the authority to cut rates for all hospitals just a little bit, the Governor's going to have to go back to that very proposition, the one rescinded just this week. I think it's a whole lot fairer for every hospital to lose a few pennies than for those hospitals that serve the majority of our clients to take it in the neck. And it seems to me if you care about Human Services generally, you will want to make sure that the Human Services pain is shared generally, and that other state agencies are participating in these difficult financial times, as well. So, if you care about fair play, yeah, there'll be people out there who'd rather not have fair play directed at them at all, but if you care about that, then the only right vote on this Concurrence Motion is a 'yes' vote."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Novak: "Gary, I wanna commend you for your hard work. I know the budget process is not a simple task down here and you've done an excellent job for us over the years. I know this is not an easy thing to do. I wanted to ask you a question. You said the Constitutional Officers are exempted from this?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative. The Constitutional Officers will not... the Governor will not have the unilateral power to impose reductions on them."

Novak: "Okay."

Hannig: "But we are hopeful that they will make some cuts on

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

their own..."

Novak: "Now..."

Hannig: "... just as we did in the Legislature."

Novak: " ... has the Governor given any indication any word, pledge, promise that, you know, once this authority is granted to him that he will try his hardest not to... In other words, are there any layoff plans in the future here?"

Hannig: "Representative, I think that the Governor will try to avoid layoffs. If we don't pass this plan though, if we allow..."

Novak: "Yeah, this..."

Hannig: "...if we allow this crisis to go on and on and on, it narrows the options that are available to the Governor. It forces him to take more drastic actions in the areas that he can directly control without legislative action. So..."

Novak: "Well..."

Hannig: "...in a sense, Representative, we could force him to lay people off..."

Novak: "Right."

Hannig: " ...should we not give him the authority to take some from other areas."

Novak: "Well, I wanted to ask that because, you know, this Bill is not without controversy. There's a number of groups that are opposed to this Bill, including AFSCME vehemently opposes this Bill. So, and..."

Hannig: "But, Representative..."

Novak: " ...puts us in a difficult position, but I'm trying to look at the other side of the coin. I mean, if we don't give the Governor this authority and then things get worse two or three months down the road and then we actually, you know, indirectly we're forcing the Governor to lay off

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

people, if we don't give him this authority."

Hannig: "Yeah, that's correct. Representative, the Governor had come forward with the plan, for example, of privatization in the prisons long before... this Bill came along."

Novak: "Right, and all of us opposed that. Yeah."

Novak: "Right."

Hannig: "It simply says that the Governor has the power in some of these additional areas to make cuts, to give him a wider option of choices. If we don't pass the Bill, he has a more narrow option of choices and layoffs become a more viable possibility."

Novak: "Right."

Hannig: "So, I would argue that this probably minimizes any type of layoff, if we give him this authority. If we don't, I think that we force his hand to do perhaps more layoffs."

Novak: "Well, you're right, Mr. Hannig. And again, I can't disagree with you on that. It's... These are difficult times, Ladies and Gentlemen, and we're compelled to act in a responsible manner as Legislators that represent our constituents. We're spending their tax dollars and we have to spend them reasonably and the Constitution requires that we have a balanced budget. So, this is not a Bill that's gonna last in perpetuity. It's... It's a Bill that's gonna last through the end of this fiscal year and hopefully, the economy will bounce back. I'm reluctantly gonna support this measure and I know a lot of people have their reasons for it and against it, but I think as an individual Legislator it's the right thing to do. And you know, there's about a third of us here in this Body that were

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

in 1991. Many of us recall, Mr. Hannig, Mr. Brunsvold, Mr. Granberg, as an example, that we were called into Special Session by Governor Edgar in his first month in office, in January. Probably, it could be 11 years to the day that we were here slashing and eviscerating the budget in 1991. But you know, the big difference is what we did in 1991 and what we're doing today is that we, Legislature, cut the budget, agency by agency, not 5% across the board what we're doing today, with authority we're giving the Governor. We have abdicated so much responsibility in this Body and we've said this to Madigan and we've said this to the Senate Speaker Republicans. We have abdicated so much responsibility, our responsibility in this Body, on fashioning appropriations for budgets. We need to go back and I hope to God when the new Governor comes into office and when the new Legislature is... convenes in 2003 that we go back to individual appropriation Bills. Now, I'm lookin' at Dave Leitch and I'm lookin' at a lot of old-timers down here that it took a lot more time... it took a lot more time, but we did, we voted every agency Bill up or down. Every Member had a chance to amend that agency Bill, every appropriations chairman had their appropriate authority for constitutional responsibility. We need to go back to that It was time consuming, but every individual system. Legislator had their input in those agency Bills. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's the way it should be and that's what we should do in 2003. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further Discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

- Kosel: "Thank you. This afternoon and or this morning in Committee you and I talked about some things and I would like to share that discussion with the rest of the Members on the floor. This is a 5% cut for the agencies that were listed by Representative Currie. Is that correct?"
- Hannig: "Representative the... yeah, the 5% is against their, their base budget."
- Kosel: "Against their base budget for the particular agencies
 that were listed, correct?"
- Hannig: "Yeah, so if you have... yes, so if you have the executive branch agencies and the others that I talked about and I think there's a few others. But yeah, so if you have a hundred dollar budget then the reserve could be \$5."
- Kosel: "It now becomes \$95. When this cut gets down to the
 agency, is the agency... now each agency has the identical
 5% cut, correct?"
- Hannig: "No, Representative. The Governor, number one, could use less than 5%."
- Kosel: "So the Governor could choose to make a 5% cut in one
 agency and a 1% cut in another agency and a third agency
 could get no cut. Is that correct?"
- Hannig: "We a... yes, Representative. We say no more than 5%."
- Kosel: "No more than 5%, okay."
- Hannig: "So we limit... we put a limit on it."
- Kosel: "Okay, so now when the cuts get down to the agency and let's say that the Governor has chosen to give a particular agency, that will remain nameless, a 5% cut. That agency now must or does not have to apply that 5% cut evenly over it's discretionary budget."
- Hannig: "Now I think the way that this will work is that for the agency directors will get a directive to cut x amount of

80th Legislative Day

- January 10, 2002
- dollars. They'll work with there fiscal officers, they'll show the plan to the Governor and if he agrees, then the Governor will send the letter over to the Comptroller saying to reserve this amount of money and these line items in this budget."
- Kosel: "So, these cuts could be applied disproportionately not
 only in the agencies but also across the agencies, is that
 correct?"
- Hannig: "They could, Representative. I think that that lends itself to the idea that if you have a plan, or if any of us have a plan, you need to share it with the Governor and tell him that this is the way we think it would make sense to find \$500 million worth of cuts. And if you can make the case, this authority to the degree that it doesn't exceed 5% would allow the Governor to implement your plan or my plan or anyone's plan."
- Kosel: "When you went through the discussion you said that there were certain areas that were off limit. One of these was the General Aid Formula for our schools."
- Hannig: "Yes, the General State Aid Formula."
- Kosel: "General State Aid... what about categoricals and ADA's
 for our schools?"
- Hannig: "They're not part of the General State Aid so they would be subject to the 5% reduction."
- Kosel: "So they could be, they could be cut. And they could be
 cut disproportionately, also."
- Hannig: "The agency, when you do the calculation, is limited by 5%. But, yes, they could take it all out of ADA if..."
- Kosel: "They could take it all out... they could take it all out
 of Special Ed. They could take it all out of gifted. They
 could take it all out of any of..."
- Hannig: "But there will be discussions between the Governor and

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

the agency, in this case, the State Board, and I think that the Governor has shown a willingness to hear input from us before he finalizes cuts. So, I think that it's a process that we can still have a say in and as I said, this does not reduce... this doesn't reduce anything in and of itself. It only gives the Governor the authority to reduce spending by 5%. So for those of us out here that I've heard earlier that seem to have alternative plans, take'em to the Governor, you can still get him to implement them under this proposal."

Kosel: "You and the other budgeteers worked very, very hard to get us a balanced budget last year, is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, we did the best that we could based on the revenue estimates at hand."

Kosel: "And in looking at... I mean hindsight again, as you said in Committee is wonderful 20/20, but you did a great job of being fiscally responsible and getting... giving us the best possible budget. We as Members literally discussed all the different options and we made priorities within that budget. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm in favor of a balanced budget. I think we should have a balanced budget. This is not the way to do it. This is not the way to do it in any way, shape, or form. We already went through this process. We can go back and look at it line item by line item and that would help. We could also decide that anything that isn't contractual within that budget can be cut right across the board at 1% or 2%, including the Constitutional Officers, including our salaries. We should not... no child in the State of Illinois should be asked to bear the burden depending on where he or she lives in the United... in this country and in this state. Sometime... something in this budget should be off limits.

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

children and our future as an extension through our children should be off limits. Many schools in Illinois rely on block grants, special education funding, transportation funding, to provide flexible spending within They need those block grants, they need those categoricals. This flexibility isn't a luxury, necessity, based upon the mandates that you and I have passed here in this Legislature, mandate after mandate that we have put on these schools. These categoricals pay for those mandates. I see no rolling back of mandates, I only see rolling back... a possible rolling back of funding. One of the largest areas of funding of... at education outside the General Assembly, to the General Funds, those categoricals for Special Education. This isn't a bureaucracy, this is about funding that goes to the classrooms to our neediest students, to the most severely disabled. We're not talking about field trips here, we're talking about children that come to school hungry, or even worse. Our schools are already financially strapped and many of them tax capped on top of being financially strapped, and they... and now there's a possibility of cutting services to disabled or further threatening those Again, it is time for us to say no to some programs. budget cuts and if we're going to say no to some of them, then shouldn't it be our children? Thank you."

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

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Hannig, and I respect you in everything that you... in your position and how hard you work on the budget and everybody that's been here for any length of time understands how important this is to you and how hard you

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

work on this. But you and I discussed in Committee other options that might be available. Is it not possible that if we voted this down, that then we, as a Legislative Body, could come forward and have input? Yes, that's tough because it's line item by line item; yes, it's agency by agency. Could we have that input as we used to as the way Representative Novak spoke about?"

Hannig: "Representative, we've had six or eight weeks knowledge, that we are in this financial crisis. I agree with you, there's a lot of things in here that know one wants to cut. The Governor, I think, feels the same way. But we also know that we have to make some cuts to bring this budget into balance. So you know, the longer we wait the worse the problem gets, so if we want to wait another two or three weeks while we go through every agency, it's gonna get worse."

Bost: "But that... but see, that's what I'm asking. Is it within our power that we could do that?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I would make the case that even after we pass this Bill, you can do that. You can go through these budgets and you can go to the Governor and say look, we've looked at every agency and we've come up with these kind of cuts that we feel comfortable with, use your 5% authority to implement those cuts, Mr. Governor. And he can."

Bost: "But the problem is when we pass this Bill the Governor goes ahead and makes those cuts and then talks to us or proposes those cuts and said yes, and then we simply say, well, we don't agree with that and the Governor, and I respect our Governor, and support him. But it's possible he could come back and say, you know you might disagree with me but you gave me this power, and by golly, this is

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

what I'm going to do. Is that true?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, again I haven't seen a list of cuts from any Legislator saying that here's 500 million..."

Bost: "But... but and if you want those, I would love the opportunity to sit down and do that with you because, because I believe that we have enough experience and enough knowledge in this Body, combined with the Body in the Senate, to come up with sensible cuts that, yes, they're tough cuts. But why is it that we've been sent here in all these years and I say this for eight years. We were able to pass when the budget was good and we made those decisions that were fun because we were able to give different people money along the years. But now it's time for us to make those tough decisions, but we aren't gonna do that as individual Members, we're gonna do that by handing the Governor a broad brush."

Hannig: "Representative, I don't see a consensus in this Body and with the Senate in the meetings that I've been in that adds up to anywhere near the money that we need to make this thing balance. Yeah, you can come up with some ideas. can come up with some ideas. Some of these other folks can come up with ideas, but in the end, ya know, they don't fit Things that you think are important in your together. district in southern Illinois may not be very important in the City of Chicago and vice versa. Things that you know you think are just absolutely essential someone else will have on a list. So I mean, you have to try to find a consensus and it's very difficult to go through it one item at a time. We've tried to do that with some budget meetings before Christmas and after Christmas, and so this doesn't preclude you, though, from making a case to the Governor, that these are some things we can do in the

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Department of Corrections instead of privatization, these are some things we can do in the Department of Human Services, and Department of Public Aid, and Department of Public Health instead of these other cuts. We can still make those proposals to the Governor, if you believe they're really there. So, I think though it's time that we go forward and that we give the Governor this authority and we make everyone understand that these cuts are going to happen, so if you've got some ideas that make sense, you better get'em to the Governor now because he's gonna impose some cuts if we don't come up with a plan."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

"As I said, I respect the Sponsor of this. But Ladies and Gentlemen, think about what we're doing. Think about what we're doing. Each one of us, and I know that this is an election year and I know many of you, many of us have primaries, many of us have general elections to face. But we were given certain power by the voting people of our districts, certain things that they wanted us to do. with that, according to our Constitution, and according to the powers that we have in these seats that unfortunately have been given away over the years in different manners, we have an obligation to go in and argue. If we give away this power, if we give away this power to negotiate then we have no more power than our own constituents, because our own constituents can say, hey, I'm opposed to that cut and I would definitely recommend a cut in this area instead. We're giving that away by voting for this Bill. that the cuts that have been proposed and I believed early on that we as a Body should have came together. I believe we should have came together during Veto Session and set

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

down as a Body and worked with the Governor, not giving up our power, but working with the Governor to modify the budget, which we did pass. I know that it's been said over the last several months, well, this is a Governor's budget. I kind of remember that there were a few of us that put a, kind of put a green light up on that budget to make it not just the Governor's budget. It's our budget. It's the budget of the people of the State of Illinois. Now, there are tough decisions that have to be made. The question is, who's gonna make those tough decisions? I respect the Governor. I think he'll make the wisest decisions he possibly can. But as a Legislator representing the 115th District, it will be very tough for me if a cut is made, to have to stand before my people and they say, well how did you let this happen? And I say, well, I didn't do it the Governor did it. No, I did do it, because what I just did was I just gave the Governor the power to do it. Many people know that my district is loaded with a lot of correctional facilities and privatization is one of the things that's been talked about as a possible cut. Privatization, if you don't have corrections in your area, you think okay, well, it's just another part of corrections, boom, we'll cut it out. No, these are jobs and these are peoples' lives. Those people peoples' have children. They do their job and they do it very well. And I'm not saying that the Governor's definitely going to make that cut, but if he would decide to make that cut by doing this, I'm saying okay, you go ahead and make your decisions and make your cuts where it's necessary. Governor, I believe, will do a very responsible thing here in trying to straighten out the state budget. We also have the problem with our hospitals. It's more than just the

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Medicaid situation, because sometimes the Medicaid budgets are affected also by what is the medicare budgets in our individual hospitals and that little bit of difference might be enough to shut those individual hospitals down. And if it shuts those hospitals down, it was in the committee today that it isn't just those people that are on Medicaid that suffer, it's all of communities because those services will no longer be available to them. Ladies and Gentlemen, making this vote says that we're going to give the Governor the ability to make cuts and we might write a letter and say, you know, I really think you ought a cut here instead, but it gives us no power, no power to influence those cuts. I listened to Representative Novak speak about how it used to be and how many times have I heard how it used to be around here where we were given the opportunity and vote on individual budgets of individual agencies and we could argue about maybe the line items of corrections, or the line items of human services, or the line items of whichever agency it might be, but at least we had the opportunity to argue about it. Now, we don't have that opportunity. We do send our budgeteers and they do a fine job, don't get me wrong But once again by doing this we're going to give there. the power to one branch, one branch. That's not the way I believe, set it up. I believe that we our forefathers, should take on the responsibility that we were sent here to I beg of you, I think a 'no' vote is the appropriate I say that we vote 'no' on this. We strongly go to our Leaders on both sides of the aisle and ask for this to come back to us and yes, the Representative said that the longer we draw it out the worse it gets. Then let's not draw it out. Let's stay here today, let's stay here

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

tomorrow, let's stay here the weekend, because that's what people sent you here to do. I'm asking, no, I'm pleading, for your 'no' vote on this so that we can go about doing what we are supposed to be doing and that's the work of the people."

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

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening to debate with great interest. And I guess the way I'm looking at this, to paraphrase the first President Bush, that this is like broccoli economics, it's supposed to be good for us but it's hard to swallow. And when I think about what Mr. Bost had just talked about, about giving up our ability for the oversight with the budget, what are we giving up when we didn't have a lot of input at the beginning? And what I didn't like with the last budget they didn't ask for our input when we took off, but now they're asking for our input when we land. I didn't vote for the budget last time. There was four of us who didn't vote for the budget. We haven't had any meaningful input into the budget, we just fight around the edges and we talk about trying to get pork for our districts or a few other things. But until we get serious with the budget process and go to zero-based budgeting and to reform the way we do our budget, quite frankly by giving the Governor this temporary power, isn't going to make much difference to us. It'll be about the same impact as a solitary snowflake landing on Lake Michigan. A few years ago when I was elected our budget was approximately \$38 billion. This year our budget is in excess of \$53 billion. It has grown much larger than the rate of inflation. We need to rein in our spending. I favor the policy of economy, not because I

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

wish to save money but because I wish to save people. We are spending way too much in Illinois. Our budgets are putting a strain on all the working people in Illinois. And what worries me is we hear about these temporary upturns in the economy. We are officially in a recession. When we are officially in a recession and a budget passes that grows over 9%, that doesn't make any sense at all. The bright spot's in the economy, we'll get there, we're not there yet. One way to help us with this budget shortfall is to have the Senate to pass our prescription drug Bill. It will save the state hundreds of millions of dollars and provide the least fortunate and our seniors with cheaper drugs. To my conservative colleagues, I say less is more. Oftentimes our conservative colleagues are arguing for lesser government, for smaller government. have a way to provide more Well, here we to constituents in this state by entering into a buying club to purchase prescription drugs which would lower the cost of our prescription drugs which would help fix the problem with the budget here. Illinois only gets about 2% off the average price of wholesale drugs when we buy them, Rhode Island on the other hand, gets 45% off the average wholesale price for drugs. Now, the State of Illinois purchases over \$1 billion a year in prescription drugs. could lower those costs by doing the buying club like the conservative Governor in Florida did, Mr. Bush, could save in excess of a hundred and fifty million dollars with the most conservative estimates and over \$450 million with the most liberal estimates. Once we pass that Bill, we'll be able to take care of a lot of these budget problems. Another thing we ought to be looking at is going after deadbeat corporations that do business in this state

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

but haven't paid their taxes. There's over a billion dollars outstanding owed to the State of Illinois that has not been collected. If we'd go after those corporations, we could fix this problem. And while we're on that subject the State of Illinois has never had a problem giving giveaways to corporations such as Motorola and giving them over \$30 million in tax grants and giveaways, yet they turn around and fire almost the entire workforce in my community of Harvard. We should be getting those monies back. And the Governor was wrong by vetoing that Bill which would require that accountability. We have an opportunity here for a temporary solution. I don't think anybody here is very happy with it, but I believe that we have to give the Governor the opportunity to make the cuts where he believes it's necessary, because quite frankly, the problem was made that end by giving too big of a budget. But I also think that this year as an even-numbered year, we're suppose to deal with budgets. And I think this is the time to take the budget process back and give it back to the Legislature and require the zero-based budgeting and to reform the system. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Crotty."

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Gary, you know, I don't think anybody's being glib when they do thank you and commend you for all the hard work that you've done and I mean that. But I'm hoping that a lot of us listened to what Representative Franks said. We need to look at the revenues. Those are the dollars that we can spend. These are going to be very tough decisions that we're going to make on where to cut and I'm positive that the Governor doesn't like making the cuts as much as we do. But we're

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

also, right now, elected officials to what the people that I call back home, Fred and Ethel. And they're depending on us to make good choices, not to look at what we're going to do and whose got primaries but right now, today, elected officials and we need to make those cuts. I think Representative Bost had brought that up and I strongly agree with that. But also, as Legislators, we've given a lot of attention to the standards in schools and making them become accountable. But over all the years that I was a school board member, and that was 15, the state never really gave us any help in doing that. In the last few years we've make an attempt to at least give them some higher funding. But yet, as we took those two steps forward, after not looking at education in 20 years, we're now taking about four steps back. I can tell you that the cuts that we're looking at have affected me, personally, since June. Not only can I talk to you about the cuts that have been made in education over the last 20 years, but also caring for an aged parent who is terminally ill and depending on Medicaid, depending on at one point for rehab nursing homes, I'm one of those families right now that are looking at tonight's news to see how will these cuts impact us. And I can tell you that the cuts that we're making are already going... they're going to be made to people that are already devastated, daily. As we sit here right now conversing and talking, we have residents that are worried about the care of their parent and educating their kids with special needs. Gary, I have one question. Prior to us getting this Bill and asking for the 5% cuts, have the departments already done a voluntary cuts on their own? Because we're talking about five or six weeks that we've been discussing this. Have we called all these agencies in

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

and said, you know we're really in trouble, go back, look at your budgets and come back to us and tell us how much can you cut out of those, voluntarily?"

Hannig: "Representative, as you probably recall, the Governor asked his agencies, the ones that are directly under his control, to make 2% reductions in their budget. So there have been some reductions already where the Governor, effect, impounded the money. Now that would be counted towards or against this 5%, this 5% would not be in addition to that. And, you know, in a best case scenario maybe the Governor doesn't have to make a whole lot more in reductions beyond what he already has. But there's no guarantee that this economy is going to come back the way people hope it comes back and he needs to have the tools that he can use to bring the spending in line with the revenues. So, if the revenues are lower, the spending will have to go lower. So, that's what the 5% gives him. to answer your question, yes, some reductions have already been made."

Crotty: "Okay. So these would be... this is a percentage over and above that?"

Hannig: "No, this... those..."

Crotty: "They're going to take that into consideration?"

Hannig: "... those reductions would count towards the 5%."

Crotty: "Okay. Have any discussions been made about... and I know we've said this in the last two Sessions about the prescription drug program and that Jack Franks has brought to us that would, in essence, save the state?"

Hannig: "Representative, I don't think anyone has any problem with the idea of trying to save money on prescription drugs. We've passed Representative Franks' Bill out of here, I think, a couple of times but it has yet to get the

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

to the Governor's desk. But even so, the problem is that we have about five and a half months left in this fiscal year. We have only so many, you know, the clock is ticking. We have to take action quickly and..."

Crotty: "I understand. I do."

Hannig: "... and that's why we need a Bill today."

Crotty: "Working with an education budget for as many years as I have, I certainly understand having to make those cuts. But I also understand that we need to look at other measures that are standing right there. And if we have a few weeks then maybe we need to bring these type of Bills before us to bring in those revenues, make major cuts, where it's not going to affect Fred and Ethel. And that's what I'm basically looking at. I would have been more than happy to come to you with proposals but I think we have done that..."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, let me tell you and everybody here that FY '03 is also going to be a very difficult year. So if you've got some ideas on how to reduce spending for this year or next year we need to know those ideas, because we're going to have a very difficult battle trying to put together a budget for next fiscal year, as well. So it isn't just for these final six months. So, it's going to be a 18-month process to get through. And for those of you who have ideas on how to reduce spending, please come forward with them."

Crotty: "In closing, over the five years that I've been here, it's going on six, many times we voted on whether we've given incentives to big business and corporations, but when we go back home, we read or we hear on the news about wasteful spending and where we could have... who got the biggest part of the pie. And at this time, we need to look

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

at those type of decisions that we make instead of looking at cutting nursing homes, cutting into Medicaid, and cutting into education. During our caucus, it was even stated by the budget that these areas already are underfunded. So if they're already underfunded, then maybe we need to look and spread that shortage across the board and not always at the same entities. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Lindner: "Yes, I just have one quick question. Because in the

Veto Session we did not have a Bill giving the Governor

legislative authority or the Legislature authority to make

the budget cuts ourselves, which would be the preferable

way to do it, as Representative Bost has said. JCAR had to

initiate the rules, the emergency rules, which hit

hospitals very hard, particularly, I know, my hospital

Rush-Copley's in Aurora, one of my area hospitals says

they're going to lose over a million dollars. So, is there

anything in this Bill or anything proposed by rule to do

away with those emergency rules that have hit hospitals so

hard, and just put them in this 5%, up to 5% mix?"

Hannig: "Representative, the 5% is a maximum that the Governor could impose. We don't require that he cut anybody 5% or even 1%."

Lindner: "Right."

Hannig: "And for those cuts that have already taken place they would count towards this 5%. In those cases where an agency has already made reductions, whether it's hospitals or whether it's the Department of Corrections, or the Department of Agriculture, those reductions that they've

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

already made voluntarily, with the Governor's advice, would count towards this 5%."

Lindner: "So, they won't be cut anymore?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I can't say that they won't be cut anymore because they weren't cut 5%, they were something less than 5%. I'm not sure, I think they're were, ya know, some percentage 2%, 3%. So, they're is a potential, in a very worst-case scenario, that you could see them cut some more. But, ya know, we all have to be optimists, I think, in life and hope that the economy does come back. The Governor doesn't want to use this power, he's not coming here because he feels, ya know, some need to cut the hospitals, or to cut the nursing homes, or cut I mean, but he also recognizes we have an obligation to balance the budget, and we're halfway through the fiscal year, we know revenues are significantly less than we anticipated and we have to reduce the expenditures to that level. So, it is just a question of bringing the budget in balance."

Lindner: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Lindner: "We never get a perfect Bill to vote on. Certainly, the preferable way would be for us to do our jobs and may I remind the Body that I have filed the agency appropriation's budget Bill for the last three terms and I believe that the House has passed this twice and it's been stopped in the Senate. But, certainly, I think, that's something we need to address next Session, because as a Body we do need to take back this power to do the budget ourselves. So, I hope that people will be considering that Bill in the future. But, as for now, this is a temporary measure, we don't have a Bill to give us the authority to

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

do it ourselves as the Legislature, so this is the lesser of two evils right now. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen Schoenberg: the House. I would respectfully disagree with those who are making the argument that we have... we are dealing with an unanticipated short-term, cash-flow crisis that was brought about by certain recent events. The situation that we have now is really the result of an inherent structural deficit within the current fiscal year budget. When you add to our existing year-to-year obligations things such as: the new pension obligations that we have, our remedy retired teachers' health insurance problem, insuring that we have enough money to pay the health insurance for all state employees. When you factor in the tens of millions of dollars in child care services that we've contracted out but that we don't issue the Bills for until the following fiscal year, when you factor in the requirement by statute as of June 30th of this year to replenish the rainy day fund by \$226 million, sudden, I think we all realize that this problem was a long-term... was not something that developed overnight, that the depth of this problem exceeded \$500 million almost from the very start, and that we are now perilously close, without any action in addressing this crisis, to reaching the same levels of indebtedness that we did when former Governor Edgar first assumed office in 1991 and inherited an unaccumulated Medicaid debt of well over a billion dollars. This situation highly unanticipated. was According to the Comptroller, and somebody please slap me if I am starting to sound like a Republican, but according

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

to the Comptroller, state receipts were down 7% prior to September 11th. And we use a bookkeeping system in state that is unlike the generally accepted accounting principals which most businesses, which most institutions, which most bond houses, and Wall Street use. If we, in fact, if we used a more legitimate means of calculating our liabilities and our revenues we would have a structural deficit that is in excess of \$1.4 billion. But through various devices that we use we have managed to create a lower threshold which, in my view and I hope in the view of many, is an artificial one. Now, having further identified the problem, I believe that silence creates a vacuum and I abhor a vacuum, so I believe that there are some alternatives that we have that we need to enter into the debate and we need to act upon. Some of these alternatives include, maximizing the increase in federal transfers coming from Washington. Now, we're all hoping that the Federal Government will increase the rate of Medicaid reimbursement from our current 50% and indeed, every point we increase it is worth another \$80 million But, I would ask my friends on the dollars to us. Republican side of the aisle to pick up the phone and call Hastert, because within that Speaker same Bush administration stimulus package is a \$400 million dollar cut that we would have to take in order to depreciate corporate losses. And we can ill afford that \$400 million reduction from the alleged stimulus package that is being Congressional Republicans by and administration. That would enable corporations to write off their depreciation up to 20 years. We can't afford to take that \$400 million hit. We are currently trying to have an expansion of the KidCare Program into Family Care,

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

by failure to act on that previously we've already lost out on approximately \$67 million. And I commend Director Garner from the Department of Public Aid for working aggressively to secure this federal waiver. But, we can do more to secure matching Federal Medicaid Funds. example, we can take unspent General Revenue Funds, such as those which are currently unused for Member initiatives, and not eliminate those Member initiatives but rather take the General Revenue Funds and apply them towards a Federal Medicaid match. We can take tobacco settlement revenues, where applicable, apply them towards a Federal Medicaid match. The state received \$80 million two weeks ago in tobacco settlement revenues, we're on-line to receive \$225 million in mid-April. Wherever we have an available dollar we should be aggressively looking to get a matching federal dollar out of Washington and there is still, I believe my friends, plenty of untapped potential. Many of us know people who are currently refinancing their mortgages to take advantage of existing market conditions. The existing market conditions have created increased unemployment. market conditions have decreased people's existing investment income, which has decreased our revenues in that regard, but what its also does has made the ability to borrow money cheaper. And, I do not believe that we should engage in short-term borrowing. What I do believe we should do is help those hospitals and help those nonprofit human service agencies which have incurred capital debt several years ago when the rates were higher to help them lower their debt, either by standing behind or refinancing of their debt, or by providing them with the technical assistance so that they can go do it. I think all of us know that most nonprofit mental health agencies

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

communities and other human service providers have all they can do to get through the day-to-day and rather their not inability to take advantage of the existing market rates and the existing interest rates, and we should help them do that. There are several other things that we should do and and I stand with this administration to provide creative solutions that do not increase our indebtedness. the other things that we cannot do is that we One of cannot, and I emphasize we cannot, there will be a great temptation several months from now to eliminate the pressure to repay the \$226 million to the Rainy Day Fund. We need to repay the Rainy Day Fund. In fact, arguably what we needed to do is institutionalize this Rainy Day Fund in a means such as that which Comptroller Hynes has proposed, and I've been proud to sponsor, that would insure that we have an ongoing mechanism regardless of what situation is, to add to and replenish that Rainy Day Fund. We have a relativity small Rainy Day Fund here in Illinois. It would enable us to save for a rainy day, to pay down our debts, to ensure that we do our... have truth in budgeting that we do not say, oh, we have a \$500 million deficit but that we're using generally accepted accounting principals, and that we have more accurate projections in revenue. Some of these are longer structural problems that need to be addressed. But this is a structural deficit problem that this budget has. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not a crisis that can be wished away. This is not the Wizard of Oz where you can click your heels together three times, close your eyes, say that there's no place like home and be back in Kansas with Auntie Em in the blink of an eye. There are larger structural deficits at work here and

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

failure to act now will only deepen the problems that we will have as we plan for the budget for the upcoming fiscal year. I urge you to vote 'aye'. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Rutherford: "Representative Hannig, I want to follow up a little bit on Representative Lindner's question. We've had rules before us in JCAR, on the emergency rules in regards to tertiary care and the bedhold in regards to nursing homes that are before JCAR and actually are in place today. If we do pass this legislation and the Governor does exercise the ability to go the full 5% on these other agencies, it's my understanding and belief that tertiary care cuts and the bedhold is greater than a 5%. Is this the ability to cut on top of those rules promulgated or is this to help bring those more severe cuts from the bottom, moving them so they aren't so severe?"

Hannig: "Representative, it's... the 5% would apply to like the whole agency, not to just a line in the agency."

Rutherford: "I understand that. But I ge..."

Hannig: "So, by giving the Governor more flexibility does the possibility arise that he could reconsider these reductions in hospitals? I think the answer is 'yes'. Will he do it? I don't know that he can. I mean he has a difficult situation."

Rutherford: "I couldn't hear that last part, so back up on that."

Hannig: "Representative, I'm saying that the 5% is not based on a rate, it's based on the overall budget."

Rutherford: "I understand."

Hannig: "So, it could be applied disproportionately... "

80th Legislative Day January 10, 2002

Rutherford: "I understand that."

Hannig: "... as long as it's within the 5% for the whole agency."

Rutherford: "Do you know... and I understand that. Do you know then is that on top of... "

Hannig: "No, no, it's the existing..."

Rutherford: "... the existing emergency rule that's in place with regards to tertiary care and outpatient bedholds?"

Hannig: "... Yeah. The intention that the Governor has is that any cuts that he's made previously would be a part of that 5%. It would count towards..."

Rutherford: "Would be a part of that 5%."

Hannig: "... the 5%. Yes."

Rutherford: "And, again... I want to clarify again, you said this is up to 5% over the entire budget."

Hannig: "The ag... yes, that's correct."

Rutherford: "So, it's not by agency."

Hannig: "It is by agency, but it's not by line item."

Rutherford: "So, you could in fact... so in effect you could say that within the Medicaid side the maximum you could do is 5%, it couldn't be 10% here and 0% Department of Agriculture?"

Hannig: "No, not with different agencies. But, within the agency he could take a disproportionate and cut, for example, all in hospitals and none in nursing homes, kind of thing."

Rutherford: "So, then just to be very clear, it is your belief that the language in this provides for the maximum of 5% for the agency and that would be inclusive of these emergency rules with regards to Medicaid bedhold tertiary care."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Rutherford: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative McCarthy."

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

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

Speaker Hartke: "The previous question has been put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the previous question is put. Representative Hanning to close."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill will give the Governor the authority to reduce up to 5% of the General Revenue budget for most state agencies. It does not compel him to reduce anything. But it gives him the tools where he finds himself out of balance to bring the budgets into balance. Now, those of us in this Body still have an opportunity to talk to the Governor about alternatives that we feel make sense in cutting the budgets. We still retain the right as Members the Legislature to introduce appropriation Bills, alternative budgets if you will, if we feel we have a plan that is better than what the Governor is talking about. But we're more than halfway through the fiscal year and it's very clear to everyone that we are out of balance in this budget, that revenues have not lived to expectations and that health care costs are beyond what anyone anticipated. Those items no one disagrees on. we have to take some action. This proposal gives the Governor the tools to bring expenditures in line with It gives him the opportunity to talk with the revenues. four caucuses, and their leaders, and their Members about how he thinks he can best do that. But, in the end it ensures that we have a process to get to a balanced budget. Because the talking has to stop and we have to get about the business of putting this budget, the FY'02 budget, to bed. Because we have a lot of work to do for the FY'03

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

budget which promises to be a very difficult budget, as well. So, the time for discussions can still go on with the Governor, but the process of setting a final process in place must go on with this Bill. We've got a process now with this Bill to end the FY'02 debates shortly. So, I would urge you to give the Governor this authority and if you have an idea you better get it to him quickly, because he needs to make these cuts soon. So, I'd ask that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 4 in House Bill 3495."

- Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 4 to House Bill 3495. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes', and 58 'noes'. And the Motion fails."
- Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, distribute the Supplemental Calendar."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 10, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the Floor for Consideration' House Resolution 606."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is Representative Monique Davis in the chamber?

 Representative... I've been advised that Representative

 Monique Davis is at the rail, if someone could please ask

 her to come into the chamber. Representative Monique Davis

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

on House Resolution 606."

Pavis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6... I'm sorry House Resolution 606 is a Resolution requesting that the Federal Government not abolish or reduce the 750 thousand that is used for DNA testing for incarcerated inmates to prove their innocence through DNA testing. It has been proposed by the Federal Government that they abolish that 750 thousand. As all of us know in the State of Illinois, a number of people have been released from prison because they were able to prove their innocence through the DNA test. The cost of a DNA test is from a hundred dollars up. Most times incarcerated individuals cannot afford that test. And I would appreciate your support on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The ayes have it. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 579, offered by Representative Mautino; House Resolution 581, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 582, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 583, offered by Representative Simpson; House Resolution 584, offered by Representative Stephens; House Resolution 585, offered by Representative Flowers; House Resolution 586, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 587, offered by Representative Monique Davis; House Resolution 590, offered by Representative McCarthy; House Resolution 591, offered by Representative Daniels; House Resolution 594, offered by Representative Fowler; House Resolution 595, offered by Representative Forby; House Resolution 596, offered by

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 597, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 598, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 599, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell; House Resolution 600, offered by Representative Currie; House Resolution 601, offered by Representative May; House Resolution 602, offered by Representative Young; House Resolution 603, offered by Representative Pankau; House Resolution 604, offered by Representative Pankau; House Resolution 604, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 608, offered by Representative McGuire; and Senate Joint Resolution 46, offered by Speaker Madigan."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions.

 Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr.

 Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- 47, Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution offered by Representative Barbara Currie, be it resolved by the Senate of 92nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, January 10, Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 23, 2002 in Perfunctory Session. And when it adjourns on that it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 29, 2002, at 12:00 noon. And when the House of Representatives stands adjourned, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 29, 2002, at 1:00 p.m."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Adjournment Resolution.

 Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does adopt the Adjournment Resolution. Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 29 at 1 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

say 'yes'; the opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 29 at 1 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction - First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3738, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for in relation to taxation. House Bill 3739, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 3740, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 3741, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. House Bill 3742, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act in relation to mines and minerals. House Bill 3743, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 3744, offered by Representative Flowers, A Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 3745, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act regarding the regulation of professions. House Bill 3746, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act to taxation. House Bill 3747, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to agricultural co-operatives. House Bill 3748, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 3749, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning firefighting. House Bill 3750, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning firefighting. House Bill 3751, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. House Bill 3752, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 3753, offered by Representative Osterman,

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 3754, offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3755, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning motor fuel. House Bill 3756, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 3757, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an concerning agriculture. House Bill 3758, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 3759, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education student assistance. House Bill 3760, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3736 (sic-3761), offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act taxes. House Bill 3762, offered by relation to Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 3763, offered by Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 3764, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act creating the Fire Sprinkler Contractor Licensing Act. House Bill 3765, offered by Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act in relation to unemployment insurance. House Bill 3766, offered by Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act in relation to human rights. House Bill 3767, offered by Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act in relation to health in the workplace. House Bill 3768, offered by Representative Julie Curry, a Bill for an Act concerning the environment. House Bill 3769, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. First Reading of these House Bills. The House Perfunctory Session will now stand

80th Legislative Day

January 10, 2002

adjourned."