69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. We bow our heads. Most gracious and kind and sovereign Father, we stand before You as newborn babes would stand before their mother asking Your hand to be upon us, to nurture us, to guide us, to comfort us. Strengthen us this day, as we make decisions. Strengthen our tired bodies. Strengthen our weary minds, even strengthen the troubles that may linger in our souls. I pray now in Christ's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative May."
- May et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Slone is excused for part of the day. She'll sign in when she returns."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative Ron Stephens is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 116

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Reitz,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, taken on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends adopted' Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1282. Representative Novak, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1599. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 163 and recommends 'be adopted as amended' House Joint Resolution Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Representative Dart, Chairperson from the 161. Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate 118. Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2391 and a

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595. Representative Shirley Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Telecommunications Rewrite, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2900."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 396, Representative Coulson. Representative Coulson. The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. Senate Bill 504, Mr. Beaubien. Is Mr. Beaubien in the chamber? Senate Bill 698, Representative Feigenholtz. Is Representative Feigenholtz in the chamber? Senate Bill 789, Mr. Dart. Is Mr. Dart in the chamber? Senate Bill 930, Mr. Hoffman. Is Mr. Hoffman in the chamber? Senate Bill 980, Mr. Stroger. Is Mr. Stroger in the chamber? Senate Bill 1011, Mr. Cross. Mr. Holbrook, did you wish to call Senate Bill 161? Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Amendment 3..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holbrook, one second. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 161 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Holbrook, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holbrook on the Amendment."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Amendment 3 creates a task force to study the Medicaid reimbursement for long-term care. Public Aid has never set forth a long-term financial strategy to do this. This sunsets. It's a one-time deal. It will report back to the General Assembly in April. And

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 161, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "I think we just heard the discussion on it. Be glad to take any questions if you have any."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, Floor Amendment #3 becomes the Bill, correct?"

Holbrook: "Correct."

Black: "All it does is it calls for a study of the long-term care funding task force which, I think, is long overdue. Let me ask you one question and I would hope... I don't know who will be on the task force. I have tried for two weeks to get an answer to the question of how the different reimbursement rates were established. If you're a nursing home in the northern suburbs, you can get up to 98 or \$99 a day. The same nursing home in central or southern Illinois providing basically the same services may get \$77 a day. And I've asked people in the Department and I've asked people who have been here many years and no one knows how

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

that happened, other than cost reports. And I would really, would really be overjoyed if the task force could study this whole concept of multilevel funding areas depending on what part of the state the nursing home is in."

Holbrook: "That's exactly what my concerns are..."

Black: "Great."

Holbrook: " ... that's why this Bill's in, Representative Black."

Black: "Great. Thank you very much."

Holbrook: "I would also hope that you would ask your Leadership to be put on this task force."

Black: "All right. I'd love to be on it. I'm getting to that age where a nursing home is no longer some abstract idea to me. Suddenly, I'm a lot more interested in it than I was 40 years ago. Thank you very much."

Holbrook: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Miller: "As far as the... never mind."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman withdraws his request. The 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? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Leitch. Mr. Leitch, did you wish to call House Bill 2391? Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2391, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2391 is on the Order of Concurrence. A Motion to Concur, with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3, has

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I'd like to thank you first for passing this Bill over to
the Senate, so that we could work out the differences that
remained among the parties. Presently, these Amendments
represent an agreement between the veterinarians, the
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,
and to the Department of Regulation which will be
administering the Bill. The Bill sets out the means by
which agents can be certified to provide euthanasia in
animal shelters and provide for a much more humane manner
of disposing of animals. And I would simply ask that you
join me in concurring with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Dave, I've had a couple of calls from county officials...

forgive me, I can't find it. Maybe you'll... They have
expressed concern only about one Section of the Senate
Amendment. As you know, some counties have veterinarians
who are the administrator of the Animal Control Act, others
aren't as fortunate. There is either... It's either in
Section 10 or 18 and I can't find it... talking about who
would administer, do the euthanasia in the absence of a
veterinarian. Now, the veterinarian, in most rural
counties, is not gonna come out and do it, so you're gonna
have to have a technician. And the question was, how many
technicians would a small, rural county have to have and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

how much would it cost to get them licensed so that they can do this?"

Leitch: "Presently, this is accomplished in all the counties through a veterinarian. And the vet, very often, will sign a protocol and frankly, in a lot of downstate communities, this is not done very... it's done in a slipshod fashion. This is a Bill that is permissive in the event that a county wants to have one of these euthanasia individuals trained. And I am told that the licensure is expected to cost... the training's expected to cost about \$200. And again, typically, there would only be, I would think, one maybe two of these individuals who would be authorized and have to go through the training to become certified."

Black: "All right. I appreciate that Dave. It's in Section 10 and the language specifically says... it's page 2 of the Senate Amendment, I believe. 'No person shall euthanize animals in an animal shelter or animal control facility without possessing a certificate issued by the Department under this Act.' Now, the Department referenced is the Department of Agriculture, right?"

Leitch: "No, it's Reg and Reg, the Department of Professional Regulations."

Black: "All right. So, Dr. Bromwell would not be involved then,
'cause Ag generally... Ag has always administered the
Animal Control Act."

Leitch: "Now, there is..."

Black: "That's one of the things that was confusing the county official that called me. So, you said that one could be... an individual could be certified under this Act that would cost the county about \$200?"

Leitch: "That's what I've been told."

Black: "And would they have to go to a university or could the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

training be given at the facility in the county?"

Leitch: "This is a course work that's done around the country."

Black: "Okay."

Leitch: "That would be prescribed by rule through the Department.

And made available, I would assume, in convenient locations throughout the state."

Black: "And it does not... The Bill does not, and knowing you as

I do, there's no intent to remove the requirement that a

veterinarian supervises an animal control shelter that's

under the Animal Control Act of the State of Illinois.

They would still have to have a veterinarian who would act
as the administrative head, correct?"

Leitch: "The veterinarian... Veterinarians have been indispensable to this entire process."

Black: "Okay."

Leitch: "What we're talking about here is a licensure... 'cause, frankly, a lot of veterinarians do not now and don't want to be burdened with going to these animal shelters and doing this."

Black: "Yeah. All right..."

Leitch: "And so, presently, there are a lot of people doin' this, frankly, might not stand up to scrutiny."

Black: "I agree. I..."

Leitch: "But the idea here is if a county wants to continue doing just what there doing with a veterinarian, that's fine. If they want the option to have someone certified, then they're able to take that..."

Black: "Okay. Fine."

Leitch: " ... course."

Black: "Thank you very much, Dave."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair. Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Representative Leitch to close."

Leitch: "I'd simply ask for 'aye' votes."

- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2391?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lang 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Granberg, would you care to vote on this issue? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2391. Third Reading on the Calendar, on page 9 appears Senate Bill 1348, Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1348 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the authorization for the Auditor General to transfer funds into the Audit Expense Funds for those non-GRF agencies that he intends to audit in the upcoming fiscal year. We will have a companion appropriation Bill that actually will authorize him to spend that money. But this is the actual transfer Bill which allows him to transfer the money from, say, the Department of Transportation Road Fund into the Audit Expense Fund. It's something we do every year. I'd be happy to answer any

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

questions. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1348?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1348, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Moore, are you ready to go with 163? Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 163. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 163 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore, do you want to handle that Amendment?"

Moore: "Yes, with leave, we'd like to adopt that now."

Speaker Hartke: "With leave of the Body, leave. Representative Moore."

Moore: "Would you like me to do the Amendment for..."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, please."

Moore: "This actually provides statutory authority for the Department to manage the.... the Department of Public Aid to manage the centralized payment processing center. It establishes the requirements of the Department must include a contract for the centralized payment processing center and requires competitive bidding. And it also creates an administrative fund for the child support program expenditures in order to segregate payments collected that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

are due parents for moneys used for programs operations. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, why has the provision about competitive bidding... if an SDU contractor who would enter into a subcontract with another entity, the original Bill had that they would have to enter into competitive bidding. And Floor Amendment #2 deletes that. Why would we want to delete that?"

Moore: "Because the competitive bidding process will be pretty thorough with a bidder who is intending to operate the program. To try and do then competitive bidding with all the subcontractors would really be cumbersome to operate the program."

Black: "So, this bidding process would be as thorough and complete as the Department did when they decided to change over. Is that what you're telling me?"

Moore: "No, actually, this is a competitive bidding process as opposed to a request for proposal process, which the Department did before."

Black: "Yes, well..."

Moore: "This is a more thorough process."

Black: "All right. Well, I'll wait 'til Third Reading. But you know my feelings on the child support issue and the State Disbursement Unit. But I'll wait until Third Reading."

Moore: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 163?' All those in favor

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 163, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of t.he Senate Bill 163 extends the time that House. t.he Department can operate the State Disbursement Unit for child support for two more years. And it also provides statutory authority for the Department to manage the centralized payment processing center. It establishes the requirements that the Department must include a contract for the payment processing center and requires competitive bidding and also creates an administrative fund for the child support program expenditures to segregate those payments collected that are due parents from moneys used program operation. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I have great respect for the Sponsor. And I'm sure she is trying to do, as we all are, and that's make the child support system work through the State Disbursement Unit, which was a very ill-advised federal mandate. My frustration is, we were supposed to have had a contractor

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

by now, and we don't. We were supposed to have been ready to run the State Disbursement Unit when it went online. were given assurances that it would run. We later found out they didn't even do a system-wide test. You all know in this chamber, it did not work. It simply was a disaster. People went without support checks for weeks and And now, here we come again, don't have a contractor, need more time. The same people who brought you this disaster, although in all good... in the defense of the Department of... division of child support, they've had turnovers since then and they were federally mandated. My argument with the Department, they have abjectly refused to seek a waiver from the Federal Government on this onerous and stupid requirement. Other states have. neighboring State of Indiana got a waiver. California told 'em to take their SDU and go visit somebody else. are states who did not abide by this federal mandate and guess what? The states did not disappear from the map of the United States. Indiana's system runs just fine. This system isn't running at all. It has overwhelmed my district office and I daresay it has overwhelmed many of And now the Department wants an extension. It's yours. time for a contract. It's time for a waiver. It's time to do something of a positive nature. I know this will pass and many of you will get up and say, oh my goodness, if it doesn't pass, the sun won't come up in the morning and the world will end. Well, come over to my district and we'll travel to Indiana and we'll visit Indiana and we'll find out, why did Indiana get a waiver on the State Disbursement Unit when we were told, told right to our face, there will be no waivers, there can be no waivers? There were waivers. I, still, in my district office, get 12 to 15

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

cases a week on child support checks that are lost, sent to the wrong address, end up in the wrong amount, suddenly have somebody else's name on it. That's not an error by anybody. You can't blame the circuit clerks now, they're out of the loop. You can't blame the businesses, they send the checks to SDU. How can you send a check for 12 months to Jane Doe and then all of a sudden on the 13th month, the check shows up made payable to Jane Smith? This has been one of the worst embarrassments I have ever gone through in the State of Illinois. It has put people in my district, and I daresay your districts, at risk. People in my district literally went hungry. Without the emergency aid, some of them would have been evicted, some were anyway. will not cast any vote for an extension of the SDU under the current operating standards. The 'no' vote on the SDU that I made two and a half years ago was the best 'no' vote I ever made. And I will continue to vote 'no'. program is broken. It doesn't need another Band-Aid. needs either a private contractor or it needs a director to go to Washington and say, look, the old system worked fairly well, this new system has been a disaster. We brag that this system is efficient now to about 80%. That's not good enough for me. If you want to go home and face constituents who still fight every day for their child support checks, you ought to vote 'no' on this Bill and we ought to just start over."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative McCarthur (sic-McCarthy)."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Representative. Although we're extending the timeline for the Department to operate the SDU, there's

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

nothing in this that guarantees that they can't enter a contract with a new vendor between now and then, correct?"

Moore: "That's correct. And that actually is the intent."

McCarthy: "Okay. And there's also nothing in this that says we have to at least go another two years with the same operation. I mean, we could actually... this doesn't stop the General Assembly from at any point in the next two years or after that, if this continues to go on, to say, we want to go back to the old way, as our friend from Danville had spoken about?"

Moore: "Well, the SDU issue, the timeline, as far as applying for the waiver to the Federal Government, has expired. So, we are in the SDU business to stay. But as far as... Any time in the next two years, it is the intent of the Department to carefully consider the bidding process and make sure, before it's actually transferred over, that we have a good solid provider willing to step in to do the job in a way that we all are desiring."

McCarthy: "Well, as of right now, we are in the SDU business to stay..."

Moore: "Yes."

McCarthy: " ... but the General Assembly has never waived any right to say we want to get out of that business and apply for a waiver, as our friend from Danville had mentioned.

Is that correct?"

Moore: "We can always try to do that, yes."

McCarthy: "Okay. Well, I appreciate your effort. I know you worked very hard on this. I would have liked to see this Bill come through the Child Support Enforcement Committee, which it didn't. But while my friend from Danville is absolutely 100% correct about all the problems we've had at the SDU, and a lot of these problems continue to happen, we

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

have a great Resolution by Representative Lyons that we're gonna look at the total system this summer, hopefully, as a legislative committee. And while we don't like to give 'em this lifeline, throwing people out on the street now and trying to just abandon the system midstream, this is, unfortunately, the best alternative we have at the time. And I will support your action. And I support the work you've done on this issue."

Moore: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The fundamental problem in child support... and I emphasize long before the SDU issue... is that the system... the computer system has never worked. Indeed, we wasted over 60 million bucks trying to make a system work that didn't work. So, when the SDU mess showed up, all that did was unmask other problems and exacerbate other problems in a system that has never fundamentally worked the way it should. Now, I'm very pleased to tell you that there is a remedy for this. And we don't need all kinds of If you recall, about a year and a half to two studies. years ago, you heard me railing away, virtually, at least once a week on the need to get a data warehouse in the Department of Public Aid. I'm very happy to report that we not only have that data warehouse, but that in April, short time ago, Computerworld has a Search for Heroes Program that said Illinois has now the best data warehouse in the United States, a data warehouse that since the first of this year has saved the state over \$25 million, that every day is unmasking fraud and other questions and helping to do reports and make the system actually work.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

And I wish I could tell you how simple I hope it will be to simply add a child support component to this And I will assure you that once that is warehouse. accomplished, and I hope it's gonna happen this summer, our child support issues will melt away. They'll evaporate. Now, perhaps you're like me, I don't personally understand why the Department of Human Services feels they now need a DCFS now thinks they need a data data warehouse. warehouse. 'Cause a very obvious, intelligent thing to do is to have one data warehouse so that the reorganization and the one-stop service that was the vision of the combination that we did back in 1996 to begin with, could actually be fulfilled. We could actually have a human service system that worked and worked very efficiently and effectively were we to actually succeed in getting the Department of Human Services, DCFS, and Public Aid on the same page. I'm also pleased that the Director of Public Aid is now working closer with the Department of Human Services. But truly, this will resolve the issue. And this is long, long overdue. So, I would urge you to join me in the quest to bring Illinois into the modern age of technology, which will bring untold benefits to the state. And did I mention that the Federal Government pays over 90% for hardware and 80% for software? So, these are very affordable, doable, if we have the will to accomplish these important steps forward to making the whole system more efficient and actually serve the people it's supposed to be serving. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I guess sometimes we have to put a target on the wall and then we

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

can talk about the target. And I guess that's what this piece of legislation before us is all about. I have become to a point of, I'm not sure if it's frustration, I know a little bit of anger, maybe quite a bit of anger when my district office, in my opinion, is now doing the work of the Department and we aren't getting paid extra to do that work. I tell ya, this whole process, this whole system... and I keep waiting for a response and an answer to dealing with this issue. But I'm very frustrated and I guess this is the place to display that frustration. We continually try to make the system work within the Department, as it is today. We get stonewalled by employees of the Department. We just have... It's an on and ongoing list, we never clear the calendar about... with constituents relative to this And unfortunately, we keep getting repeat constituent issues on this very same situation. I don't know how to resolve this. I've been waiting, I guess, for somebody else to come up with legislation to do it, but I think there's got to be a better way. And we've got to move forward and we've got to quit the stalling, the stalling, the stalling. Let's simply get the job done, get a new system in place so that people who are entitled to this money, because it's their money, can feel that the system is working for 'em and this ultimately, you know, affects children. So, I stand here today in just absolute frustration over this whole issue that it's no better than it was two years ago. And I don't see anything today that's gonna make it any better and that's for frustration. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Sponsor.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady will yield."

Schoenberg: "Representative, there are provisions in this Bill that relate to competitive bidding for the SDU contract that you alluded to in your opening remarks."

Moore: "Yes."

Schoenberg: "Why is it necessary to competitively bid this contract? Why is it necessary to incorporate new provisions in the law for competitive bidding of the contract, when under the reforms of the purchasing laws, all these contracts were to have been competitively bid in the first place?"

Moore: "It was my understanding, Representative, that this contract actually went under the request for proposal part of the purchasing ordinance. And now, that's... this new standard increases that to a total competitive bidding process. Excuse me. I would like to elaborate further, that actually, there was an intergovernmental agreement which does fall under this purchasing guideline that was established. And we know it was not thorough enough. And of course, the result we all know well. This will be... That's why these standards are more stringent for that competitive bidding process rather than just going to an intergovernmental agreement."

Schoenberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've watched several others comment on this and I probably should have just let it go. But as Representative Wirsing expressed a while ago, the concerns that we have, each one of in our legislative offices, as we've dealt with this problem. I have to agree with Representative Black, maybe a 'no' vote should have

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

been right a couple years ago. The sad thing is, is once again the Federal Government has come in their great wisdom and decided that we should set up this disbursement unit, and even though many of us had counties that were very successful..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Bost: " ... at the disbursements."

Speaker Hartke: "Please, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Bost: "Unfortunately, we're down this path to a point we can't turn around. And maybe this... by going forward is the only option that we have. But I think today, I just want to frustrate... express my frustration. And I'm sure many Members on this House Floor feel the same frustration. Once again, the Federal Government has held money over our heads and said this is what we're gonna do even though our system was working. Now, we've created a monster that's been really rough to feed. And once again, we're extending the time period. We're going through this whole process to try to handle something that was being done very well by our local county officials. We said, quite often, we say local government's better, but unfortunately, the Federal Government has come and said, no, no, no, big government's better in this case. So, I guess we have no option but to support the Bill. Maybe in protest, I'll vote 'no'. But I do commend the Sponsor on her work to try to straighten the problem out. But I think it's necessary for each one of us to express to our constituents how disappointed we are in a failed system whenever we've tried to take over as big government with the wonderful computers and we're gonna take care of the world's problems, but the computer's not capable of handling this problem. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hamos."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a sleeper Bill, a very important Bill. And although we are hearing a lot of frustration with the system... the state disbursement system, a 'no' vote on this would really create chaos, chaos for moms and dads and the children who need to receive child support. A 'no' vote on this Bill would mean an immediate end to a system that we know is complex, took a long time to develop, still has kinks, still needs work. And a 'no' vote would mean that the Department would either have to operate it without statutory authority or it would simply end on June 30th. Our... Speaker Madigan, in this version of the Bill, has added some provisions from the Auditor General's Report that are very sensible..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh. Please."

Hamos: "... need to be in this Bill. And even if we are frustrated with the SDU, we need to give it a little more time to see if it can be effective. We need to vote 'yes'. We need to make this work. We cannot create chaos out of our own frustrations. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore to close."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all of us share in that one issue, and that issue is frustration. But there have... we have made great strides to follow with the instructions that came with the Federal Government in order to have a more complex, efficient, and effective method of finding people who owe child support payments from outside the state. The provisions that are in this Bill actually tighten up and give good directions to what the Department must do. And as was stated before, June 30th is the deadline. That must be extended or there really would be chaos. But there are good provisions in this Bill. And I

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

would recommend support."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 163?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mautino and Davis would like to vote on this issue? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 Members voting 'yes', 5 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 163. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 432 for Representative Poe."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 432.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 432

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to honor milestone events in the lives of citizens of Illinois; and

WHEREAS, Donnie Beechler recently participated in his fourth Indianapolis 500 as a driver; and

WHEREAS, Donnie Beechler started his racing career in 1982, earning Rookie of the Year honors in the sprint car division at the Springfield Speedway; and

WHEREAS, Donnie Beechler has 5 career U.S. Auto Club Silver Bullet wins; and

WHEREAS, Donnie Beechler had the fifth fastest qualifying time at this year's Indianapolis 500, registering a lap speed of 224.449 miles per hour; he started the race in 27th place and moved to 7th place before an oil fitting problem knocked him out in the 147th lap; he returned to the race in the 151st lap and

69th Legislative Day finished 25th; and

May 31, 2001

WHEREAS, Donnie Beechler finished a career-best sixth in 2000 Indy Racing Northern Light Series point standings and is one of the 33 fastest drivers in the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Donnie Beechler on his racing career; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Donnie Beechler as an expression of our esteem."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Poe."

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Poe: We do have quite an honor here in Springfield and having a Springfield native. This is a guy that grew up right here the edge of town of Riverton, and now he lives in Sherman of my hometown and we're quite proud of him. But I want to tell you real quick, we got three of his honorary pit crew here and you might recognize one or two of them. But one of them is Kirk Brown, I don't know if you guys ever heard of him. He... he's a neighbor out there with Donnie and supports Donnie and he was over at the race with him Sunday. Okay, we got Jay Keller, who's at Chicagoland Speedway and another great supporter of speedways here in Illinois. Then he's got a neighbor, Jim Williamson, that helps him, but they won't let him change tires yet. He's gonna work up to that. But you know, this is really a special... this is his 4th ride at the Indianapolis 500, but he went through the month of May and people not knowing whether he was gonna get a ride. So he went over, luckily, a week before the race, A.J. Foyt talked to him and told him that if it was possible, he would get him a ride in the Indianapolis 500. So they got a car ready and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

they had a lot of wrecks that month, but if one other driver could qualify then that would give Donnie a chance to qualify and get in the race. Well, luckily, the last Sunday of racing the other driver qualified, so that meant that Donnie got to get out on the track, and when he did, I think A.J. Foyt actually had to tell him to slow down a little bit, because he set the 5th fastest time at the Speedway that year. When you do that on the last Sunday and you qualify, that means that you don't actually start 5th, because those place slots are already filled. went to the 27th spot. And when he did, he moved all the way from 27th up to 7th place when he had an engine So, I want to... at this time I want Donnie to say a couple words and as you can see many of us in this chamber couldn't even get in a car with the size we are and so Donnie's short and muscular and can stand that 500 miles. So, let's give Donnie a great big welcome and a salute to Illinois for all of his success in the future."

Donnie Beechler: "Thank you very much. I... this is truly an honor for me to, to be here with you. I want to thank Raymond. He was at the race. I probably needed him as a spotter for me 'cause he seen the smoke before anybody. But A.J. Foyt did give me the opportunity this year to, to run at the 500 and I think he felt kind of bad, 'cause he called me Tuesday, a few days ago, and he says, 'How bout we go run Texas next week?' He says, 'I kinda owe you something there.' It made me feel good, 'cause we've been struggling for a year to find some sponsorship, but it's a... it is truly an honor to be here and for A.J. Foyt to have me drive for him and give me that opportunity to run 224, so thank you very much. This is also my family. This is my wife, Paula, and this is my little girl, Shae, and my

- 69th Legislative Day

 May 31, 2001

 little boy, Colton. And I take them everywhere I go.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Congratulations. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 432?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chairs, the Chair has it... the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Senate Joint Resolution 26, Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 12, Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1041 and Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2432."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1640, Representative Rutherford. On a Motion to Nonconcur, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move to nonconcur."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1640. All those in favor signify by saying... No, I did that already. House Bill 1840, Representative Giles. Mr. Giles."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1840."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

does nonconcur with House Bill 1840, Senate Amendment #1. Senate Bill 435, Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 435 and requests a Conference Committee Report... a Conference Committee be appointed. Senate Bill 839, Representative Bost. Out of the record. Senate Bill 843, Representative Wirsing. Representative Wirsing."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 843..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: " ... the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, I think there is a Floor Amendment #3. Okay. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 843, a Bill for an Act concerning child welfare services. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wirsing."

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

Senate Bill 843 simply provides the creation of the Direct

Child Welfare Service Employees License Board to carry out

the implementation of direct child welfare service employee

licensure. It creates a licensing board within the

Department of Children and Family Services and specifies

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the members and qualifications of that... duties of that board and provides for a rescue in the event of a conflict of interest. That's the basic core of the Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Dart: "Dave, this is setting up a licensing board. Who are they gonna be licensing?"

Wirsing: "This'll be to license those... I'm tryin' to find the description of the... But it's people within the DCFS, who are employed within DCFS, to have a licensing. The purpose then is that it has teeth to it. That if they do not adhere to the parameters of being licensed they... you know, they can be reprimanded or removed from that position."

Dart: "Okay. I guess and maybe you can probably clarify for me. So, this would be licensing caseworkers or would this be licensing the agencies, the private agencies or would be both?"

Wirsing: "The child welfare worker is who it'd be licensing."

Dart: "Okay. So, it'd be licensing both the welfare workers who are employees of the Department, but al... would it also be licensing the employees of the private agencies, as well?"

Wirsing: "Yes. Yes."

Dart: "I guess the question I have right now then is, what are we doing now? It would seem to me that people who come to work as child welfare workers, we would make sure they have qualifications and the like. And I would hope that they'd be licensed or something. Are..."

Wirsing: "Yeah. Currently, the director is doing that. JCAR

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

says they don't like that. So this is the attempt then to satisfy JCAR by creating that board which has the criteria list who will serve on that board. It's not only people from within DCFS, but outside of it, as well."

Dart: "Okay. And so then that group that'll make up the board will be the individuals who will then put together the criteria for what it would mean to be a licensed caseworker."

Wirsing: "Yes."

Dart: "Did you have understanding whether or not that the attempt would be to have those qualifications be pretty much what they are right now, but they'd be done statutorily now instead?"

Wirsing: "I'm sorry. We can't hear you over here."

Dart: "Okay."

Wirsing: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh. Please."

Dart: "Dave, is it your understanding that the qualifications that they're gonna be doing via this board are gonna be the same ones that they're using now or are they talkin' a higher standard... change in the standards?"

Wirsing: "It's the same ones they do now which my understanding is those are good standards. It's just that one person administers those standards and JCAR says that ought to be a board or... you know, a wider variety of people. And they can also make recommendations as they go through the process to change some of the needs of the licensing. There is some flexibility..."

Dart: "Okay."

Wirsing: " ... as this moves down the road."

Dart: "Well, now, what's gonna be the remedy? Because one of the problems that we've had, historically, has been caseworkers

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

who aren't any good, who are bad and shouldn't be doing It's a small minority, but nonetheless, we have problems with some of the caseworkers. What would this do far as... How would we be allowed to get rid of them, the caseworkers who are the ones that should not be there who are either not following through, botching cases? 'Cause the Department just had a case that was in the newspapers about two weeks ago where they were hit with a judgement of \$3.3 million based on a caseworker from downstate Illinois who apparently never showed up to the home where he was supposed to be going. The children were severely abused, thankfully they weren't killed. But they were severely abused while on that person's watch. What is it that we're gonna do with this that's gonna insure the caseworkers that come to our attention that are not good that we're getting rid of 'em?"

Wirsing: "Under this, it specifies that the board then would have the authority for a final determination concerning that particular caseworker, where currently, it's up to the director to do that without clear-cut as far as what the qualifications are. You know, there's a hearing process that that individual would go through. It wouldn't be the board simply meeting on a day and say, you're fired or you're reprimanded or whatever. There is... Would be hearing process for the employee."

Dart: "Okay. Have any of the different private agencies weighed in as far as what they think about this?"

Wirsing: "No. Yeah, there is no... there's no opponents and DCFS and the Illinois Association of Public Health Administrators are in support of this."

Dart: "Okay. And what... Dave, I think you mentioned, who are gonna be the people that make up this board?"

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Wirsing: "Yeah, let me find the... It'll consist of nine members appointed by the director of the Department. The director shall annually designate a chairperson, vice-person. The members of the board are composed of five licensed professionals from the field of human services with degrees in that. And let's see, then at least two which must be employed in the private, not-for-profit sector and then one which is in the public sector and then two faculty members of an accredited university. And finally, two members of the general public who are not licensed under this Act or a similar rule and who'll represent consumer interests."
- Dart: "Okay. And then so just so I'm clear, finally, is this board then would basically be in charge of developing the standards for the workers and enforcing them as well, so that this would be the entire agency or the part of the Department and is in charge of all of that?"
- Wirsing: "Yeah. It would be the current standards and then with, you know, satisfactory agreement to that."
- Dart: "And you feel comfortable that in the event of say, caseworkers who are not doing their job, that under this process, we will be able to get them away from children pretty quickly?"
- Wirsing: "Yeah. That's... As the Bill come over and you know, I was asked to pick it up and then I was reading and looking at it, I really like this concept that probably some of the problems in the past with DCFS, which some have been corrected, is the fact that this licensure Act was not there and you know, there was one person. Not saying the director wasn't doing a good job, but it may have been too massive to really define and look at each individual case on its merits. So, I think this process, to me at least, seemed to be a step in the right direction."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Dart: "Okay. Thanks, Dave."

Wirsing: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield. Ladies and Gentlemen, shhh, please. It's very difficult to hear out here and we'll be repeating questions and answers. Please, let's tone it down."

Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Wirsing, please accept my apology if I am asking you redundant questions, but because of the noise in the House, I was not able to hear the answers in which you were giving Representative Dart. Now, you are creating a licensing board and this board will be licensed to do what and to whom?"

Wirsing: "This board will be in charge of reviewing and doing...
going through a hearing process for child welfare workers,
okay, who are in that realm, that's what their profession
is, where... and it gives the board the authority then, if
someone is not doing their job or someone says they're not
doing their job, then at least that individual has the
board there as a way to seek out the truth, if you will, on
that individual whether they're doing their job or not.
Where, currently, it is under the realm of the director of
DCFS only. That's so... It broadens it with a wide base of
individuals who are required to serve... who would serve on
the board, coming from a whole different area of
professions and so on."

Flowers: "Okay. So, now, are we takin' the authority away from the director, as far as the hiring and the firing is concerned, because now the board is... Now, but let me just kinda back up to my first question, please. The board is going to license the workers... to license them to do what?

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Because they're already employed and they have the educational background, so what are they going to need a license for? They're not gonna be licensed to be foster parents are they?"

Wirsing: "The licensing process is a way to put teeth into the process."

Flowers: "But wait, just let me..."

Wirsing: "Now, and..."

Flowers: " ... let me just kinda understand..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Flowers: " ... because..."

Speaker Hartke: "Please."

Flowers: " ... I understand what you're saying in regards to them being licensed. But you know, when we put the law into place, that's the teeth. What is this board gonna license these workers to do? Just... Would you just answer 'yes' or 'no' to this. Will this board license these workers to become foster parents? Is that what you're doing?"

Wirsing: "No, not at all."

Flowers: "Okay. So, now, what will this board... Will all the employees of DCFS walk before this board to become licensed?"

Wirsing: "Now, wait a minute. They will be licensed by this board, yes."

Flowers: "So, every employee of DCFS, irregardless of their educational background, irre... how... What standards?

Because if I've been working for DCFS for the last 15 years..."

Wirsing: "Okay. First..."

Flowers: " ... what are you gonna license me to do?"

Wirsing: "First of all, it is the child welfare worker that's gonna be licensed."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Flowers: "The child welfare worker is gonna be licensed to do what?"

Wirsing: "Well, currently, to do what they do now is to work with the children and this is the creation of a licensing board.

All right?"

Flowers: "Now, let me..."

Wirsing: "Which, I understand that they are already licensed, but they are under the crit... under the realm of the director only. This creates a licensing board then that will look at the individual if... I mean, if somebody calls up and complains and this is how I would perceive it would work. If someone called up and he complained about one of these individuals working in that area..."

Flowers: "Okay. Okay."

Wirsing: "I didn't want you to get... be hearing both ears at once there."

Flowers: "Okay."

Wirsing: "Yeah."

Flowers: "These people are already licensed..."

Wirsing: "Yes. This is grading..."

Flowers: " ... child welfare workers."

Wirsing: "Yes."

Flowers: "This board will oversee these licensed workers."

Wirsing: "Yes, thank you."

Flowers: "This board will then be able to terminate these people upon violations that they may have in regards to their license and their contract to do business with DCFS?"

Wirsing: "And through a hearing process and they could revoke their license."

Flowers: "My question, my last question to you, Sir, is, will this board supersede the director..."

Wirsing: "Yes."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Flowers: " ... with regards to termination?"

Wirsing: "Yes."

Flowers: "So, and my next question, who... will there be minorities on this board? Will there be former foster parents, will there be former foster children on this board? So, please tell me, again, who will make up the board, please?"

Wirsing: "The legislation calls for creation of a nine-member board and let's see, five of those will be licensed professionals from the field of human services with a degree in human services or equivalent course work, at least two must be employed in the private not-for-profit sector and at least one of which in the public sector, two faculty members from an accredited university who have child welfare experience and are in good standing with their profession, two members from the general public who are not licensed under this Act or any similar rule and will represent the consumer interest. That's the way that the language is in the Bill."

Flowers: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wirsing to close."

Wirsing: "As I'd indicated early to one of the Representatives, that as I had read this Bill when it come over and I picked it up, it seemed to be moving in the right direction without to me that the creation of this board takes the responsibility out of... away from one person and gives it to many in a cumulative sense. I think this is good for DCFS. And would ask for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Bill 843... or pass a Bill... Senate Bill 843?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Jones, would you like to vote on this Bill? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 843. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 335, Representative Monique Davis on a Motion. 335. Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, we make a Motion to Nonconcur with the Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 335."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 335?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 335. The Chair recognizes Representative Moffitt. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Moffitt: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Moffitt: "Actually, it's an inquiry to Speaker Madigan's earlier inquiry. And ... we're at ease here, really, government has ground to a halt on this final day. And when we opened, Speaker Madigan specifically was wondering as to the whereabouts of Representative Brady and there's been a Representative Brady siting now and I wondered if the fact that he's here if maybe government would continue on now or could you enlighten us on this?"

Speaker Hartke: "Good morning, good morning, Mr. Brady. It's good to see you here this morning. Okay. Thank you for that information, Representative Moffitt. Representative Crotty, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

House. If you wouldn't mind taking a few minutes to welcome... in the gallery we have the fifth-grade class from Fernway School which is the Kirby School District in 140 that serves Tinley Park, Orland Hills and Orland Park. This school really is in, my friend, Representative Renee Kosel's district, so please all welcome our group here from Orland."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly, your State Capitol. Recognizes Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "I wanna thank Maggie for recognizing them. The teacher is an old family friend and the school is located within my district. And we want to always welcome our students down to Springfield to see how our government works. Welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Recognizes Representative Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that House Joint Resolution 45 can be heard in the Committee on Aviation, Senate Bill 113 with House Amendment 2 can be heard in Judiciary I, the Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment on House Bill 148, and the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments on House Bills 2844 and 25 can be heard in J-II, that the Motion to Concur with House Bill 29... the Senate Amendment on 2911 can be heard in Redistricting... thanks... House Resolution 348 and Senate Joint Resolution 6 and House Resolution 370 in State Government, House Resolution 372 in Transportation, House Resolution 403 in Ag, House Resolution 365 and SJR29 in Conservation, HR398 in Constitutional, HR374 Disabled, HR390 in Elections, HR399 and HR387 Elementary, HR385 in Environment, HR350, HJR46 in Human Services, HR388 in Labor and SJR33 in Registration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're okay with all of those

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

with the exception of HJR45, object to the waiving of the posting."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie, did you hear his objection?"

Currie: "What was the question?"

Cross: "I..."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you repeat that, Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we are fine with all of those you've requested to waive the posting requirement with the exception of HJR45."

Currie: "Well, what's your problem with HJR45?"

Cross: "Well, we object to the waiver."

Currie: "Well..."

Cross: "We just need more... we need more time."

Currie: "But... So, you want me to delay my Motion until you've had a chance to look that Resolution over. Is that what you're suggesting?"

Cross: "No. We..."

Currie: "I'd be happy to postpone my Motion..."

Cross: "No. We want... We'd like..."

Currie: " ... until you've had a chance to look at it."

Cross: "Representative, we certainly want to move the process along with the others and we're okay with those, but we object to the waiver of the posting requirement on HJR45."

Currie: "All right, then. Why don't I amend my Motion to leave that particular Resolution out of consideration and move that we suspend with respect to the others."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Fine. And we're just gonna proceed as normal on HJR45.

There'll be the normal posting requirement."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Currie: "Yeah, I will ask you to reconsider your objection and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

have a more careful look at the Resolution."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there leave with the exception of HJR45?"

Cross: "Yes."

Speaker Hartke: "Leave is granted. Recognizes Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my understanding that the Aviation Committee is going to be cancelled this afternoon.

Is that correct?"

Speaker Hartke: "We'll get back to you on that, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik, that's correct. Mr.

Clerk, would you read the House Committee schedule."

Clerk Rossi: "A committee schedule has been passed out. following committees will meet at 12:30 or immediately following the Republican Caucus. The Judiciary I-Civil Law Committee in Room C-1, the Judiciary II-Criminal Law Committee in Room D-1, the Redistricting Committee in Room 114, the State Government Administration Committee in Room and the Transportation & Motor Vehicles Committee in Room 118. The following committees will meet at 1 p.m.: the Agriculture Committee in Room 122-B, the Conservation & Land Use Committee in Room C-1, the Constitutional Officers Committee in Room D-1, the Disabled Community Committee in Room 118, and the Elections & Campaign Reform Committee in Room 114. The following committees will meet at 1:30 p.m.: the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee in Room C-1, the Environment & Energy Committee in Room D-1, the Human Services Committee in Room 122-B, the Labor Committee in Room 118, and the Registration & Regulation Committee in Room 114."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner for a caucus announcement."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would request an immediate caucus in Room 118."
- Speaker Hartke: " ... in Room 118. Republicans will go immediately to Room 118 for a caucus. The Democrats will go to lunch. The House will stand at ease until the hour of 2 p.m. Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, just an inquiry. I understand they are going to caucus. Do we have a plan on the committees? I know that committees had indicated that we will be meeting at 12:30. Have you decided what we should do with regard to those?"
- Speaker Hartke: "If you had listened to the Clerk, the House Clerk, the House Clerk indicated that committees will begin in those rooms immediately after the Republican Caucus."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner, how long do you expect to be?"
- Lindner: "We expect to be at least an hour, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "At least an hour, Mr. Hoffman."
- Clerk Rossi: "Attention, Members. The 12:30 committees will meet at 1:45. The 1 p.m. committees will meet at 2:15. The 1:30 committees will meet at 2:45."
- Speaker Hartke: "The House will come to order. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 427, offered by Representative Feigenholtz; House Resolution 428, offered by Representative Hamos; House Resolution 434, offered by Representative Acevedo; Senate Joint Resolutions 34 and 35, offered by Representative Novak are assigned to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Slone, Chairperson from the Committee on Conservation & Use, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 365 and Senate Joint Resolution Representative Stroger, Chairperson from the Committee Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were on referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 388. Representative Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 348 and House Resolution 370, Senate Joint Resolution 6. Speaker Madigan, Chairperson from the Committee on Redistricting, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 103 and House Resolution 372. Representative Michael Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' House Resolution 403. Representative Novak,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 385. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 148, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2844 and a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Senate Joint Resolution 33. Representative Boland, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 390. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 387 and House Resolution 399. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

350, recommends 'be adopted as amended' House Joint Resolution 46."

Speaker Hartke: "Senate Bill 839, Representative Bost. Out of the record. House Bill 3288, Representative Pankau. On the Concurrence Motion on Senate Amendment #1. Please explain the Amendment. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3288. This is an Income Tax Revisory Bill from the Department of Revenue. provides many technical changes, things that either the Department has been doing but has not had the authority to do, or cleanup on various things. I can move right through them, if you like. For example: we're adding Subchapter S to Section 702 and 704, which is a limit to the education expense credit of \$500 per family. Some changes in the statute, moving the exemption for income received from a ridesharing arrangement to the appropriate Section. are several erroneous Sections that we're fixing. We're establishing clearly, in statute, that it's the State Board of Education that decides whether a TECH-PREP program meets the requirements for an income tax credit. Provides for appropriate withholding for substantial winnings at racetracks and riverboats. A technical correction to references to the United States Tax Court, reporting requirements and new statutes of limitations for refund Authority to withhold income taxes from worker's claims. comp payments, so that people don't suddenly find they have substantial liability at the end of the year without having known so. Permits refund periods for taxes for partnerships to apply to all partners, so that we don't end up with more paperwork than the value is worth. And then some protection so that if somebody is permitted to have a

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

decrease in taxes, that they have long enough to collect it before the statute has run. And then there is codification of a recent court case that shows how people can elect to treat income as business and nonbusiness income. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and would appreciate your support for this revisory Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to tell you it's a little noisy in here, so if I ask some questions on things that she spoke about, I apologize. It's just a little... I don't know... chaotic. So, would the Sponsor yield? Controlled chaos, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. Well, proceed with your questions. We'll..."

Cross: "But... An inqui... Representative Currie, I guess our Calen... we must have some problems with our Calendar. The way we read it we see another Sponsor in the Calendar. Can you tell us when you took over sponsorship and how you did?"

Currie: "This morning by agreement with the original Sponsor."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "All right. I'm sorry. I'll be right there. All right.

Is it true that Arlington Race Track is still opposed to this Bill... or this Amendment?"

Currie: "I don't know."

Cross: "Was there a committee hearing on this Bill?"

Currie: "There was, and there were several witnesses who appeared. I don't remember exactly who they represented."

Cross: "When did we have a committee hearing on this Bill?"

Currie: "We had a committee hearing on this Bill early this week,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

unless it was late last week."

Cross: "All right. Our understanding, I guess I asked it wrong, is that Arlington Racetrack is opposed to this Bill... has been opposed to it. Is there anything in this Bill that would take away their opposition, based on what you believe, or what you probably would know their opposition's based on?"

Currie: "I think I mentioned a provision in the Bill that requires racetracks and gambling boats to collect withholding on winnings above \$2 thousand. That provision, currently, applies to racetracks with respect to in state winners. This provision would also apply to out-of-state winners, who otherwise might escape their Illinois Income Tax liability. So, this is the way the IRS sets it up for us to collect that kind of withholding. We don't currently do so, and I don't see any reason why in state people ought to be fulfilling their tax obligations and the out-of-state winners, not."

Cross: "Is there the concern, that if this Bill passed, either from someone in DCCA, or could we get some answers that people will quit coming to Illinois to gamble? That the other states, whether Wisconsin, Indiana, will be more attractive because of the way our income law... income tax laws would be structured?"

Currie: "I don't know how many people there are who expect when they go to a riverboat or a racetrack to win above \$2 thousand. My guess would be that the number in any given day who reach that stellar amount is relatively small. So, my expectation is that people would continue their usual practice, whether it's to gamble in Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Indiana. And it seems to me only fair that out-of-state winners ought to meet their liabilities to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Illinois just the same way in state winners do."

Cross: "Well, I'm not a gambler, so I don't know that mentality, Representative. But it seems to me one of the concerns we've had as a General Assembly is we need to be conscious of what other states are doing in this arena. And in order for us to be competitive we need to keep an eye on what other states are doing. And it just seems that one of the risks we run in proposing this Bill or this Amendment is that those that enjoy this type of entertainment may choose to go to another state. Do you... Are there any opponents that you know of, other than the racing industry... horseracing industry and the gaming industry?"

"That's all we've heard from and I don't believe we've Currie: heard of any opposition until the eleventh hour. But, as I say, Representative, I think that it's not fair to say that out-of-staters don't have to pay their Illinois taxes when they win at the track. And it seems to me good public policy to make sure that there is withholding from those who are bringing home 2 thousand or more dollars. If we find those people, you know, they will owe the tax. it's much harder to pay what you owe when you've spent your winnings than it is if they were withheld, if you're appropriate amount of liability were withheld in the first place. So, if you're interested in going after deadbeats, then I would say that a 'yes' vote is the right vote. also remind you that there is much else in this Bill, a variety of other taxpayer-friendly initiatives, and cleanup language that is important for the orderly and efficient operation of the State Department of Revenue."

Cross: "So, we're not ending up with a single subject type Bill here, where we try... where we put something bad with something good and we all have to vote for it. That's not

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

your intent?"

Currie: "Not at all."

Cross: "Okay. It's our quest... It's our understanding or belief that... and please clear this up for us, that the tracks and the boats already withhold?"

Currie: "My understanding is the tracks withhold from in state residents who earn... who win more than \$2 thousand. This would make that provision applicable to the out-of-state people who, by rights, do owe Illinois taxes on winnings in the state, but without withholding it will be difficult to track them down. In addition, the provision would apply for gambling boats that may not be doing withholding in state or out-of-state, today."

Cross: "What about casinos?"

Currie: "Now, we do catch up with those people, but it may be a year down the road. And it may be that when they discover they have this increased liability, that they have a very hard time paying it."

Cross: "Does this apply to casinos? Is this your understanding, because casinos..."

Currie: "Yes. Yes."

Cross: "What do you do with international travelers, who are in the Chicago area on business or conventions? What does this Bill do with respect to withholding?"

Currie: "That is income earned in the State of Illinois and it is taxable."

Cross: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Currie: "It is income earned in the State of Illinois and thus, taxable to the State of Illinois."

Cross: "So, you'll withhold?"

Currie: "They may be able to... It's conceivable international folks would not have a liability. I assume they could get

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

a refund or establish that at the moment of winning. But if you're from California and you earn income in Illinois, you have an income tax liability in Illinois."

Cross: "What's the rate we're talking about here,

Representative?"

Currie: "Three percent. Same rate you pay, same rate I pay. And one of the issues here is that in state people are subject to withholding, while out-of-state people are not."

Cross: "Does this apply, as well, to offtrack betting parlors?"

Currie: "Yes."

Cross: "All right. Mr. Speaker, in the event this gets the requisite number of votes, we request a verification."

Speaker Hartke: "A request for a verification has been granted."

Cross: "And when the respect... with the understanding that we're trying to move along, Mr. Speaker. I understand there's some other people with their lights on. I'll defer to those Representatives at this time."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady will yield."

Brunsvold: "Representative Currie, let's get a little more specific in my area. I have a boat in Rock Island, and then we have a boat in Davenport, and a boat in Bettendorf.

How would this affect that situation?"

Currie: "They would be withholding the appropriate income tax payment from in state and out-of-state winners of \$2 thousand or more. So, if you win your 64 bucks, this doesn't apply to you. It's only if you earn more than that. Now remember, if you're an in state person and this winning is traced to you, ultimately, you will not only have liability, but the Department of Revenue will be able to find you and will be able to collect the payment you

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

owe, conceivably, with interest if it's two years later, because you failed to include it in your income tax form. And by that time, of course, you may well have spent the cash. And you may have trouble meeting that obligation."

Brunsvold: "Don't we have to file a..."

Currie: "So, in a sense, it's a protection."

Brunsvold: "After you make so much money, don't you have to file a 1099?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Brunsvold: "After you make... After you have accrued, like \$12 hundred, I think, or something like that, you have to claim that. The boat has you fill out a 1099 form."

Currie: "We're not certain of the threshold, but there is a threshold after which you'd be required to fill out the 1099."

Brunsvold: "I'm just wondering, because whether you're from Illinois, or from Iowa, you're gonna still fill out that 1099."

Currie: "But we don't get the 1099, the feds do."

Brunsvold: "Well, I'm sure, you know, the feds..."

Currie: "This is the... Would... You'd be..."

Brunsvold: "If they're gonna claim this on their income tax, I'm sure the Department of Revenue would have access to gambling winnings."

Currie: "And, in fact, they do. They do, Representative. So, Joe Shmo, who lives in Peoria and who goes to the boat and wins \$3 thousand, they'll find that person if the information appears on the 1099. Now, maybe a year or two down the road, and by the time they discover that Joe Blow didn't pay Illinois Income Tax on that sum, Joe Blow will not only owe the original, but possibly penalty and interest. So, the withholding is a protection for the in

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

state person..."

Brunsvold: "Can I deduct..."

Currie: " ... the out-of-state person is harder for us to find."

Brunsvold: "Can I deduct, from my income tax, my losses?"

Currie: "Not in this state."

Brunsvold: "Federally, I can deduct my losses..."

Currie: "Yes."

Brunsvold: " ... up to my winnings?"

Currie: "Yes. But, not in Illinois."

Brunsvold: "So, in fact, I'm gonna pay up front. And maybe a year later I might be able to deduct some of it. Is that what we're saying?"

Currie: "Not for Illinois purposes. This... We're talking about the withholding for Illinois that you would not be able to deduct... you would not be able to offset with your losses."

Brunsvold: "Does Iowa, for example, in my case, does Iowa do this? Do you know..."

Currie: "I do not know."

Brunsvold: " ... if the states around us..."

Currie: "I don't know."

Brunsvold: "I don't know if they do or not. I would guess they wouldn't do this. In that case, let me put to you a situation. If you're a big gambler, and I believe, there's a small percentage of the gamblers are considered high rollers, if you will, that spend a large proportionate of the money. Why would they want to come to Rock Island, as opposed to Davenport, or Bettendorf, if they don't have to pay this money up front?"

Currie: "Well, I'll tell ya, if they're in state, sooner or later, we'll catch up with them."

Brunsvold: "Well, I mean, they're out of state."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Currie: "So, it doesn't matter."

Brunsvold: "They're out of state and they..."

Currie: "If they're out of state, I'm not sure they know the rules well enough to know, and of course, if you do catch up with them sooner or later they'll have the liability."

Brunsvold: "But if I'm a high roller and I want to spend... and you know, they're gonna lose a lot of this money. They're gonna lose a lot of money, probably, on the boat. And they're gonna spend a lot of money, and once in a while they may win a lot, yes."

Currie: "Well, they owe the..."

Brunsvold: "But, generally, they're gonna lose a lot."

Currie: "They owe the money, whether they pay it or not. It's their liability."

Brunsvold: "And I think there was a testifier in a Senate committee that actually put a proposal forward that this would actually be a negative loss of revenue for the State of Illinois and for the local gambling boat."

Currie: "There was no testimony in Senate committee, and there was no testimony in House committee..."

Brunsvold: "Yeah, well, there..."

Currie: " ... to that, or any other effect."

Brunsvold: "There's a situation that I think would exist, then...

I, evidently, talked to this gentleman that would say that if we lose the high rollers we'll actually lose a lot of losses in money to a boat like mine in Rock Island, or Alton, or East St. Louis. That those high rollers will not spend that money in Illinois. And in that, in fact, will mean a revenue loss for those particular boats in the State of Illinois."

Currie: "But, Representative, they owe the tax in Illinois. The question is the collection mechanism."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Brunsvold: "But that's..."

Currie: "So they owe it, and the question is, do we want 'em to go on being deadbeats, or do we want to make sure they pay what they owe."

Brunsvold: "But, Barbara, they may not win very much. They may lose a lot. But they're not gonna lose a lot in Illinois. They're gonna lose a lot in Missouri. And they're gonna lose a lot in Iowa. And we won't be able to collect those taxes on that money. And probably, a very small proportion of time are they gonna be winners."

Currie: "But of course, we're only going after the winners..."

Brunsvold: "Those guys... exactly right."

Currie: " ... \$2 thousand or more."

Brunsvold: "But they won't even come to spend the money, if the situation exists, and I think that's the argument that the boat owners have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Pankau."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Pankau: "I know this is the last day of Session, and I know that we're all eager to get on with things, and have other things on our mind. And there are 13 ingredients to this Senate Amendment. However, if you are particularly sensitive to gaming interests, and to the horseracing industry, please pay attention. There are two components in the Senate Amendment that, basically, talk about collecting the earnings, collecting the tax, right away from out-of-state residents, not in state residents, out-of-state residents. The gaming industry itself, to be very fair, feels that this is unfair competition. The states around them, particularly, those boats that are

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

along the Mississippi do not have these same provisions. They feel that it could potentially be considered a new tax, as in, that some of them aren't paying it right now. So, although we have many things on our mind, we may be many different conversations. If this is a holding particularly sensitive issue to you, please pay attention. You will want to vote 'no' on this Concurrence Motion. however, you feel the other overriding features are of more value, then please vote your conscience. I just wanted to make everybody aware of what exactly is in this Concurrence Amendment... the Senate Amendment and in the Concurrence Because should the Concurrence Motion pass, this Motion. is the way it goes. This is when it becomes law and this is how it goes to the Governor's desk. So, with all due respect, please pay attention. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield for questions. Shhh."
- Wojcik: "Could we have it a little quieter in here? This is very serious."
- Speaker Hartke: "Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've got a lot of work to do this afternoon. Please."
- Wojcik: "Representative Currie, how many persons are involved in this type of legislation to take the... How many people are from out of this state? Do they have the numbers?"
- Currie: "We don't know, because we don't have that collection, right now. We may have numbers on in state winners of more than \$2 thousand, because, as to racetracks, that is current law. Racetracks are collecting withholding from Illinois citizens if they win more than \$2 thousand at the

- 69th Legislative Day

 May 31, 2001

 track, or at the OTB."
- Wojcik: "All right. Now, when you win a jackpot, I'm under the theory here that it's only for slots. Correct? Blackjack, Caribbean stud, none of that is incorporated into this legislation."
- Currie: "I believe that's right, as a practical matter. I believe that's right."
- Wojcik: "Well, isn't this discrimination? I mean, if it's good for one it should be good for all games on the boat."
- Currie: "But I think it has to do with the way the winnings are paid and that the..."
- Wojcik: "Actually, there's..."
- Currie: " ... the ability of the track or casino to meet the requirements depends on how the payout happens."
- Wojcik: "Well, I think there's some good abilities when you're looking at Caribbean stud, because those jackpots get rather high. Now, another question I have."
- Currie: "Yeah. There would be. There would be withholding, if it's over 2 thousand."
- Wojcik: "When an individual wins a jackpot, and they receive, I believe, it's called a 1099. Does the state get a copy at that time? Or is it just the gaming boat?"
- Currie: "It goes... That is a form that goes to the Federal Government for purposes of federal tax liability."
- Wojcik: "What about the state?"
- Currie: "We do get the information from the 1099. The state does not get a physical copy of the 1099."
- Wojcik: "But, when you get the information..."
- Currie: "But we only get the information for Illinois taxpayers.

 So, Illinois taxpayers we catch up with down the road."
- Wojcik: "When you get the information, and it is an individual that has won a jackpot on one of our riverboats, is it so

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

stated where the resident of that person is, or where that person resides?"

Currie: "Yes it is. And, of course, we don't get the information of those who live out of state but, in fact, owe taxes in Illinois, because this is the state wherein they won the jackpot."

Wojcik: "Would you, by any chance, or does the Department of Revenue have any number that they're dealing with that they feel that they're losing money?"

Currie: "We don't know because we don't get that information."

Wojcik: "Well then, why are we doing legislation like this if you don't have all the specifics?"

Currie: "Well, we'd like to know. And we'd like to think that out-of-state people pay taxes just the way in state people do. And we'd like it... make it easy, easy for taxpayers in state and out of state to meet their liabilities, to meet their obligations."

Wojcik: "And what other states are doing this?"

Currie: "I can't answer that question."

Wojcik: "You can't answer it."

Currie: "But this is the way the basic federal program is set up with this option available to the states."

Wojcik: "Well, I think the Bill is... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

I think the Bill is flawed. It's discriminating. What we're looking at here is, we're looking at someone who is just winning a jackpot on a slot machine. We're not looking at all the gaming incidentals that are on the riverboat. It's a very bad precedent to start. And I think that it's a very bad idea. And I would just ask everybody to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. It's a

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

simple revisory Bill from the Department of Revenue, including many important efficiency propositions for the Department, including also the proposition that we ought not to encourage deadbeats, from out of state, to duck their Illinois tax liability. And we ought to make it easier for Illinois residents to pay their taxes at the point at which they win the money, rather than down the road, when they've spent the cash and can't meet their obligations, owe penalty and interest, and so forth. This is a Department proposition. It came out of the Senate without a negative vote. And I encourage you to vote your conscience here, and vote 'yes' for the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3288?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote The voting is open. Vote your own switches. There has been a request for a verification. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there are 36 Members voting 'yes', 72 Members voting 'no', and 7 Members voting 'present'. Bill, having failed to reach a Constitutional this Majority, is hereby declared lost. On a Concurrence Calendar appears House Bill 2432. Mr. Kenner on Senate Amendment #4. Please explain the Amendment."

Kenner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Give me a quick second here to
find my material."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Kenner, you filed a Motion to Nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. And that's your Motion?"

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 and 2."

Kenner: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment #4..."

Speaker Hartke: "Just a minute, Mr. Kenner. Just a minute."

Kenner: "Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, could you reconsider the Motion
that was just taken? I'd like to concur with Amendments 1
and 2 and 4."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the question. Mr. Kenner moves to reconsider the question on the Motion to Nonconcur. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House rescinds their Motion. Out of the record. House Bill 1041, Representative Bradley on Senate Amendment #1 on Concurrence. Please explain the Amendment."

Bradley: "On Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1041. One Section is removing language that was redundant due to the implementation of the Service Contract Act and transfers those responsibilities to the Department of Insurance.

Another Section extends from 30 days to 45 days the time which an insurance company has to respond to a request by the Secretary of State for information regarding whether a driver is covered by liability insurance."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Amendment #1?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

Bill 1041?' All those in favor will signify by voting

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1041. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Concurrence appears House... on Motions appears House Bill 12. Representative Mathias on Senate Amendment #1."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 12, which originally passed the House, was a Bill to award World War II veterans a diploma if they left high school before graduating in order to serve in the armed forces. It passed overwhelmingly in the House... when it got to the Senate they added the provision of the Korean War to it. It does not have any other provisions other than World War II and the Korean Conflict. I ask for your support of House Bill 12."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 12?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 12. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Concurrence Motions appears House Bill 1599, Representative Daniels on Senate Amendment #1."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very proud to stand up and present to the Illinois House the Empower Illinois Plan which deals with revitalization of the coal industry throughout the State of Illinois.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

This is a plan that has been worked on for several months. As a matter of fact, beginning with our coal initiative, I might point out to you a little bit of history. Some nine months ago in Southern Illinois, when I was down on a trip visiting several individuals down there, I was meeting. The meeting consisted of several individuals including Representatives Bost and Representative Jones and the gentleman turned to me and he said, 'You know, we have some great natural resources in this state and those resources involve coal, 250-year supply of Illinois coal that we can help develop and create new jobs, put the coal back to work, create incentives for Southern miners Illinois and create economic development for our state.' And as I was going through that, I listened to this man and learned a lot about it that meeting, the importance of Illinois coal. 'Cause I must admit that all I had learned about coal over the years was some of the plight of coal miners throughout the state, some of the difficulties they'd faced and the fact that in the strip mines and the coal activity of the past, Illinois had fallen behind. But when I found out the importance of 250 years of reserve of Illinois coal, it seemed to me that this was worth the effort. I then put together several meetings to follow up meeting with staff, meeting with other with that, individuals throughout our nine-month period from August of last year to come together with a plan called Empower Illinois. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, it struck me, very interesting, when today I picked up the newspaper and I noticed in that newspaper dated Thursday, May 31, year 2001, that the headlines of the Chicago Tribune had in it Illinois's South Drained of Clout. And it struck me that what has happened to our state when a portion of our state

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

has lost its influence, governmentally and legislatively. But at the same time I sat and I thought to myself, you know, that's just not accurate. Because I know Members of our caucus and Members on the Democratic side have worked very hard to address the issue of economic development for Southern Illinois. And yes, there's been some population losses, losses of jobs, but in Southern Illinois we now have an opportunity to revitalize an industry that's so needed that the President of the United States himself stood up and said, 'It is time now to create an energy policy of this country that includes t.he development of coal and coal-fired plants.' So, it struck me as we are talking today about empowering Illinois and the citizens of Illinois for new economic development and job creation, what a great opportunity we have as a legislative Body to once and for all stand up strongly for this state's natural resources. So, I believe that real clout exists within people that are committed to work together for the purpose of accomplishing good results. You know, we received 11 thousand signatures from Southern Illinois citizens, petitions that were mailed back to us, where these people said, 'The message is clear. We need you as Legislators to help us develop Illinois coal without using taxpayer dollars, without changing laws on incentives that cost taxpayers additional money.' They said they were tired of empty promises and they wanted results, not rhetoric. And with the passage of House Bill 1599, we can prove that the voice of people throughout the state and all parts of the state still matters and that's what clout is all about. Now, people have asked me at various times why a northern Illinois Legislator is so interested in coal in Southern Illinois. The answer is simple. I believe that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the state could be heading for an energy crisis similar to what California has experienced and I believe the time is now that we in Illinois have to take an aggressive state for a meaningful energy policy that speaks well for our natural resources and gives us the opportunity for economic development, job creation, and the utilization of natural resources, our God-given natural resources, that we can use for the development of this energy policy. So, I was pleased to see President Bush include coal in his energy policy. And frankly, I was pleased to see all of us come together to work for the common goal, because House Bill is a compromise between our Empower Illinois Program 1599 that we filed on this side of the aisle and initiatives that were filed by Legislators on the other side of the aisle, namely Representative Reitz Representative Granberg. Now, last August when we started this meeting in here in Illinois concerning Illinois coal, we had many, many ideas and that the citizens brought to our attention. And during the coming months since then, we brought together and worked with coal mine owners, experts, economic development directors, utility company representatives, local officials, academic authorities, government officials through the Governor's Illinois Coal Association and the United Mine Workers all to come together with a plan that will work for Illinois. And we began formulating the task of developing this program on empowering Illinois. And while we may have disagreed with colleagues on the other side of the aisle on how to accomplish our goals, as time passed it became clear that we all wanted the same result, the same result to develop Illinois coal. And that's why I asked Governor Ryan to call a summit meeting so that we could all come

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

together to negotiate the best possible compromise package that could be put together. And thanks to Governor Ryan's leadership I believe we have achieved historic results in putting a plan together based on Empower Illinois and the framework that was developed there. But before I briefly mention the details of this Bill, I'd like again to thank my friend, Governor Ryan, who stuck with us until the was done, who made sure that the commitment was there and his staff was willing to put in the time and the effort. Now, House Bill 1599 contains many features and benefits that can be broken down into three main categories. first is economic encouragement. The second is the wise and environmentally-sound use of Illinois's And the third is utilization of incentives in law today, already existing, that may be applied to the Simply put, these initiatives will result industry. in Illinois being economically able to use our God-given resources including our 250- to 300-year reserve of coal to provide a permanent source of new electrical energy and provide a boost to the economy of Southern Illinois. important. We made sure that our state's this is environment wouldn't suffer by insuring the best in clean technology is being used and utilization of that technology. And I'd like to thank Representative Andrea who participated in these discussions for her Moore stewardship on these issues and her attention to t.he environmental policies that are contained herein. In 1599 is good for our economy and good for thousands of coal miners that are out of work and good for construction industry of Central and Southern Illinois. \$1.7 Specifically, this Bill contains billion in low-interest loans from revenue bonds, plus tax incentives

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

to coal companies and energy producers that are willing to build power plants using state-of-the-art clean new Illinois coal technology. Secondly, it contains 500 million in low-interest loans from revenue bonds for power companies to retrofit older plants with scrubbers that meet federal pollution standards and to reimburse companies the sales tax that was paid on the purchase of Illinois coal during the first year of the implementation of this plan. Next, it also provides \$500 million in low-interest loans to companies that would provide alternative, environmentally acceptable sources of energy, things like wind power, solar power and renewable resource It also provides \$300 million in low-interest loans revenue bonds for the development of power transmission lines and facilities. These transmission lines will be utilized to place the energy and power developed on the grid that then can be transmitted throughout various parts of Illinois. Part of the plan is another \$500 million in revenue-neutral, and I emphasize, revenue-neutral, general obligation bonds to assist new electric generating facilities. That incentive must be voted on on a separate piece of legislation due to nature of the bonding and will be brought to you shortly. So, House Bill 1599 contains a \$415 million cap per borrower to encourage competition, so not one borrower can use up the dollars available. It also provides the fast-track permitting from mine-mouth power plant construction and creates the Governor's energy resource cabinet to facilitate and streamline future energy policy decisions. Ladies and Gentlemen, this single piece of legislation will do more to revitalize the economy of Southern Illinois than anything else we've done in the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

quarter of a century that I have been a Member of this General Assembly. Passing House Bill 1599 will help bring new and lasting prosperity to Southern Illinois. It will put coal miners back to work. It will help developers create new businesses that will provide a better life for thousands and thousands of Illinois families and it sensitive to our environment. It puts us in a win-win situation. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's not Southern Illinois lose its clout. Let's empower them. Let's empower our citizens by making sure that our electrical needs will be met in the future. Let's empower those companies that want to bring renewed prosperity to families who want a better life for their children and their children's children. By voting 'yes' to House Bill 1599 we'll end this Session by letting Southern Illinois know that we care about them and their futures fact, they still have the best interests of this state at heart as we do of them. I want to publicly thank my colleagues, Representatives Art Tenhouse, Representative John Jones and Representative Mike Bost for their tireless efforts and point out to you that Art Tenhouse worked for 11 years for a co-op utility company. Representative Bost literally drove coal mine trucks that helped the coal industry in the past and brought a great deal of personal knowledge to this particular plan and Representative Jones had extensive experience in the utility field and the It was because of their personal knowledge, coalfield. their personal ability to deal with issues of this nature that made this Bill such an important piece of Bill (sic-legislation). So, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm very proud to present a bipartisan Bill for passage today."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bost."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bost: I truly believe that this is probably the best piece of legislation that I've been able to participate in and be a part of and support since I've been a Member of this chamber. in 1975 I can remember my grandfather coming home, he'd been a miner all his life. My uncle who had worked right beside him in the strip fields there in Sparta, they came home and said, 'It's gonna close.' And, you know, many people in Southern Illinois suffered that same fate as we watched coal mine after coal mine close, our good-paying The anger that was felt in Southern Illinois jobs left. towards the Clean Air Act and the problems that existed and I know many Legislators fought to try to reverse that. They thought that if it just went away we could cure the So, for years Legislators tried to work to do problem. that, but they also tried to work to improve the capabilities of our power plants. We offered incentives, we did different things to existing power plants to try to make sure they would burn Illinois coal, but still that We've add... put money into our universities to study the issue, but always as we've worked, we fell And people of Southern Illinois would talk little short. at the coffee shops and they'd talk on the street corners, what are we gonna do? We watched our children leave the We watched as your population, those of you from the north, as your population grow as the jobs grew, we had to fallback and regroup and try to figure out how to have economic development without the mines. With the hope that maybe, someday, something could happen that they could come back. I never dreamed, even though that we were working hard to try for something like this to come to pass, that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

it would come to pass while I was in the Legislature. There was predictions that maybe, maybe in time, maybe if gas prices did this or the energy needs climbed. Then we would have the opportunity to tap that resource and as clean coal technology increased we'd be able to tap that resource, but now, all those things have lined up. Now, we have the opportunity, with this piece of legislation, to have sensible generation of electricity with coal, clean generation, generation that we can work with the coal resources we have to produce the electricity that the State of Illinois needs to provide the need that you're going to have if you're in the collar counties or if you're in Chicago as the server farms are being built and that need electricity continues to climb. opportunity to provide for you that electricity that you need so we don't suffer like California suffers. This Bill gives the opportunity for Southern Illinois people to come back to work. They wanna work. They're willing to work. This will give them that opportunity. This legislation was not thrown together. This legislation was put together with a lot of hard work from a lot of dedicated people. want to thank Lee Daniels. I want to thank Art Tenhouse I want to thank your side of the aisle, and John Jones. Kurt Granberg, Dan Reitz. By coming together and George Ryan bringing us together to come up with this piece of legislation that is a compromise that will provide for the needs. We sat down with the environmentalists. perfect Bill for them? No. But does it put us into a situation that we burn coal cleaner in the State of Illinois than we are now? Yes, it does. Today... You know, in Southern Illinois, when we've suffered through all this, we have to tighten our belts with a lot of things.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

And we, in Southern Illinois, quite often have to put on two hats. On the floor with us today is a gentleman by the name of Tom Denton. He and his wife and his children are here. Tom is a police chief in Perry County, but he's also the Economic Development Director for Perry County. He has worked with us on this legislation. Folks, a lot of people have put a lot of hard work into this. I am so glad that it has come to fruition. I am so much in support of this. I look forward to voting this green switch and I encourage each one of you to vote for it. Thank you to everyone who's been involved with it. I encourage your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, as we come forward with this piece of legislation, House Bill 1599, it's been referred to 'the coal Bill for Southern Illinois' and that's not quite true. This is an energy Bill for the State of Illinois. This will benefit the entire State of Southern Illinois. Yes, it will benefit Illinois tremendously, but this piece of legislation has taken several months to draft. But as Representative Bost said, Representative Daniels said... Representative Bost and I have been here for seven years and ever since the day we arrived in the General Assembly we have been working with many people to try to figure out how we revitalize the coal industry in Southern Illinois and benefit the entire state. House Bill 1599 does that exact thing that we've set out to do. The incentives in this Bill will be tremendous for Southern Illinois, Central Illinois, and the entire State of Illinois. But, Speaker, I would like to thank a few people for their support of this Bill and for working on this Bill over the last several months. I want to thank

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Governor George Ryan because, quite frankly, I think if he hadn't called the coal summit this Bill would not be before us today. I want to thank Leader Daniels for his hard work on this Bill. Representative Tenhouse. But I also want to thank a couple of Gentlemen that I cosponsored Representative Bost also cosponsored Bills with them and I think without their Bills this legislation would not be here before us today. And I want to thank Representative Granberg, Representative Reitz for your tremendous hard work in this effort. But along with Governor Ryan, I want to thank his office and Renee, Pam McDonough of DCCA, Mike Murphy and the list goes on and on of the people that had something to do with this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, encourage you to support this piece of legislation, but I would be remiss if I did not thank the person that's probably put more work into this than anybody else. She's had a handful this spring in this Spring Session. She did telecommunications for the rewrite the House of Representatives on the Republican side of the aisle, but she also did this Bill also, and I want to thank our staff member, Jennifer Ross. Thank you, Jennifer. Speaker, with that I would just encourage everyone to vote 'aye' on this. You know, there was a gentleman in the committee last night, in E & E Committee, that made a statement and he said, 'Illinois has plenty of electric power. We don't need new plants.' Well, I got news for people that think like that. We can sit back today and defeat a Bill like this and we can be just like California is, five years from now. We don't want that to happen in the State of Illinois. We want an abundance of power in the State of Illinois and this Bill will do it. Ι encourage you to vote 'aye'."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Mr.

Reitz. Reitz."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reitz: "I have a couple of questions, I guess, for legislative intent. This Bill provides that the authority of a taxing district to abate taxes expires in January 1, 2010. Does that mean that at any time up to January 1, 2010, a taxing district could agree to abate the taxes on a new generating plant under these provisions for the following ten years?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Reitz: "And also, in order for a taxing district's abatement of taxes to be effective for a qualifying electric generating plant, would the plant owner have to agree to repay all the abated taxes plus interest if he closes the plant before the end of the ten years?"

Daniels: "Yes. That requirement is provided for in the Amendment."

Reitz: "Thank you. To the Bill. Close enough. To the Bill. I appreciate all... I'd like to join with Representative Jones and Bost and Chuck, when he gets back in the game, but no... sorry. This legislation, as we said, we've been working on this for a long time. I guess I've been working on it for ten years, since the last time David Phelps and Larry Woolard passed legislation ten years ago that we thought was going to help with two generating stations in Illinois and let them continue burning Illinois coal. Coal is an integral part of the economy in Southern Illinois. I worked in the coal mine for 17 years and that mine shut down because of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. There are a number of people that worked with me that I hope have an opportunity under this to go back to work. A

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

few... probably a month and a half or so ago this... we seemed to be mired in partisan politics and in the end maybe it worked out well. We were able to elevate this issue to the point where I think we have a Bill that can make a tremendous difference for all of us in Illinois, but especially the people that I worked with in the mines and to their families. I would also like to thank the Governor As I said, when we were mired in for his leadership. partisan politics earlier this Session we were able to get the Governor to step in. His administration did a great job putting everything together. Renee Cipriano did yeoman's work trying to bring the language together, the components of all the Bills that we had on the floor and all the ideas and a few new ideas that are incorporated in this that I think are going to bring generation stations to the State of Illinois. Mike Murphy from DCCA worked well and everyone in DCCA sure helped put this together. Representative Jones and Bost and Granberg and my roommate here or close to roommate, Phil Novak, Chairman of Energy & Environment (sic-Environment & Energy) has done a great job also not only on the deregulation Bill, but also on this I think Southern... this will bring Southern legislation. Illinois from trying to sell coal, which is hard to market right now, to selling electricity. I think that's good for the whole state, good for everyone in Northern Illinois because we can help meet your energy needs and the growing energy needs that you'll have in Northern Illinois. good for Southern Illinois because it will help our economy. So, on behalf of all of the coal miners, former coal miners and hopefully, future coal miners and their families in Southern Illinois, I'd like to thank everyone involved in this legislation and I'd ask everyone to stand

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

up and vote and help us support the Illinois Resource
Development and Energy Security Act. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fowler."

Fowler: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

"I stand in very, very strong support of this House Bill, I have spent my life in the coal country in Southern Illinois. I know the importance it plays in the economy down there. I know what it's done to communities that saw the coal mines close and the miners lose their jobs. probably has something to do with the decrease in In the last census it resulted in us losing population. another Congressman downstate because people had to there to find work. I, myself, worked in the coal mines when I was 17 years old. You know, it's been said many times that we have much more coal reserves in this country than the Arab countries have oil. So, if coal doesn't make the comeback that we know it's going to, what happens to our economy? What happens to our country when the oil is all gone? And I think each and every one of us here believe that the day is coming when the oil will not be as bountiful as it is right now. I, too, want to thank each and every one on both sides of the aisle who worked long and hard to see this Bill brought to the point it's at A few years back, when the coal mines started today. closing in the Southern part of the state, many, people said, coal is dead, but there were those who said, no, coal will be back, coal is king. And I think today, as we stand here and we ask for assistance in passing this very, very valuable piece of legislation, we realize how important coal is, not only to Southern Illinois, not only to the State of Illinois, but to the whole country. You

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

know, not too many years ago the people in California thought they would have power forever and ever, it was endless. But they have been shown that their thoughts on that were wrong. So, again today, I stand in very strong support. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, from the north and the south to support this very important piece of issue (sic-legislation) and to vote for this Bill, 1599. I would hope that we would have a unanimous vote on it here in this Assembly today. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Representative Forby."

Forby: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. T'm standing here today to support 1599. I live downstate. come from down there from a coal mining family. retired from the coal mines. I had two brothers that worked in the coal mines. The mines shut down. to go out and find jobs like a bunch of other people down there. Since the coal mines have shut down, our economic development has hurt us really bad in Southern Illinois. So, I am glad to see that both sides of parties came working together and come up with a Bill like this. One of the things for me running as State Representative for Southern Illinois, everybody says we need to get our coal Bill back, we need our coal. This coal is gonna help everybody in the State of Illinois. So, once again, I just want everybody to support this Bill. This will be a good Bill for the whole State of Illinois. Thank you. I want you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative McCarthy."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- McCarthy: "Representative Daniels. I'd like to say someone from above I-80 is asking a question but... The... I just had a question about the bonding. The \$3 billion is broken down on our analysis. It shows 1.7 billion can be used to finance new power plants. Can you give me just a general idea? Is this mandatory like matching grants, or are these just direct grants that the companies that are gonna build these plants... Is it in the legislation that they have to put up some capital, as well?"
- Daniels: "These are revenue bonds or low-interest loans. And they're secured by revenue that would come from the power plant or the coal mine plant. And they have to be solid and secure in making sure that they're able to be repaid."
- McCarthy: "But is there a mandated contribution by the company or the owner of the power plant or..."

Daniels: "Well, there would ha..."

McCarthy: "Say they're putting..."

- Daniels: "There would have to be in order to qualify for the revenue bond because it would have to be secure in the repayment of those bonds. Without some kind of guarantee, those bonds would not be secure and therefore, wouldn't be available to be sold."
- McCarthy: "Did you know off the top of your head, though, is it like a 50/50 matching thing for a company who's gonna put it in there? Or is that not defined in the legislation?"
- Daniels: "It's not provided in the legislation. But again, I want to emphasize that there has to be some guarantee that would be available to pay off those revenue bonds or they would not be able to be secure."
- McCarthy: "Okay. But it's... So, if an old plant wanted to put in some scrubbers or something and there was a 50 million... I noticed in one part of the analysis, it says,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

'no grant can exceed \$100 million.' Seeing that they... to put in these scrubbers was 80 million. I don't know if that's a adequate number or not. They could get bonding for the entire 80 million or would they have to put up-front money in there, as well?"

- Daniels: "All right. Let me make sure you understand that the \$100 million you're referring to is on the GO Bond language, which is not in this Bill. That's the General Obligation Bonds that are a different type of bonding. And those do require that they make sure that they have a very secure repayment, and they have to certify and be certified they'll be revenue neutral. Those GO Bonds will be paid back. The revenue bonds, which are a different bonding form, and the 1.7 billion are loans, not grants. So, I want to make sure that as we debate this, you understand these are not grants. These are loans. They must be repaid. They have to be secure. And the company borrowing them will have to show the ability to repay them and the security will have to be sound enough to make sure they're repaid."
- McCarthy: "Well, I thank you for your explanation of that. I was confused, I have to admit that. The other thing is, you said that the General Obligation Bonds are no longer part of the package. Is there still a limit on that the top grant could be \$100 million or is that..."
- Daniels: "Yes, there will be. That'll be in another piece of legislation that we'll be considering later. Because of that bonding authority, it'll require 71 votes to pass.

 And that'll be submitted to the General Assembly for the GO Bonds, which will deal with new electric generating plants."

McCarthy: "Well, I thank you for your answers. And I thank my

- 69th Legislative Day

 May 31, 2001

 southern friend for coming up behind me and helping with
 those answers."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Slone."
- Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Gentleman will yield."
- Slone: "Leader Daniels, are there any incentives in this package for utilities to take some of the older, more polluting coal plants offline as the new, cleaner capacity comes online?"
- Daniels: "You know, I'm sorry, Representative, I could not hear what you said. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."
- Daniels: "Maybe we could ask that either the sound be turned up or... I was having trouble hearing the full question."
- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, would you please get some quiet in here. Shhh. Please."
- Slone: "Thank you. The question was whether there are incentives in the package for the electric utilities to take any of the older, more polluting coal plants offline as the new, cleaner capacity comes online?"
- Daniels: "It doesn't require that. But the incentive packages is really meant to encourage the development of new mine-mouth plants, new electric generating plants, or in the case of the revenue bonds that could be utilized for scrubbers, to make sure that the old plants that are in existence today are retrofitted with new scrubbers to allow them to meet new environmentally... environmental standards to make sure that our clean air is protected. So, it doesn't require that old plants be shut down."
- Slone: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. I really want to compliment everybody who's worked so hard for so long to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

put this piece of legislation together. I think that this has been a great effort. And I certainly have every hope that it will be helpful to the coal mining industry in this state, which can certainly use the help. Nevertheless, coal is a dirty fuel. And Illinois high-sulfur coal is a dirty fuel. So, I think that we should take advantage of these new plant subsidies to increase capacity, help the coal industry, but also to help meet new source air quality standards and improve people's health in this state. While energy prices are high, we should be using that opportunity to increase efficiency, to encourage clean, renewable energy, and to reduce air pollution and its adverse health effects. So, I would encourage everyone who has been working on this legislation, while I congratulate you, I would encourage you to consider some kind of trailer legislation that would help us take some of the dirtier, older plants offline as we gradually replace them with cleaner, new capacity. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to add some comments about this historic, momentous occasion here in the Illinois General Assembly. I believe all the parties involved worked very, very hard to fashion this Act entitled the Illinois Resources Development and Energy Security Act. And I think it's a very, very appropriate name for this new Act that will soon become law under Governor Ryan's signature. Let me just broaden the prospective here a little bit about this whole situation with... as some have alluded to an energy crisis in this state. I mean, let's be honest with each other, the sky is not falling in Illinois with respect

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

to lack of capacity. There's a lot of megawatts coming online right now. Over 11,000 megawatts are coming online Since we passed the deregulation law in in this state. 1997, many new independent power producers and even some of our own utilities are taking another look at generation in this state and increasing capacity. Do we need this Bill? Absolutely. Do we need to revitalize the coal industry in Southern Illinois? Of course. Technology has changed in the last 20, 25 years. The new technologies, clean coal technologies, coal gasification as an example, will burn coal at a much lower rate of pollution. Much, much lower than what some of our old, aging fossil fuel plants are doing in Illinois as it is. So, it is an important endeavor as we go into the 21st century. It's important that we have adequate capacity. But if we didn't pass this Bill, we would not go into an energy crisis. The key thing here is this, is that new plants might take one or two years to come online, demand is increasing in Illinois for more power. Corporations are looking to Chicago and elsewhere in the suburbs to build Internet hotels that would use vast sums of electric power so they can do their business. So, we need these new power plants. It's very, very important that we have those. And again, all the people that were involved, I want to say thank you for your hard work. It is an historic piece of legislation. And I would just like to point out, specifically, one person I think that has put so much work and time and effort... to me, she's done a brilliant job. And that's Renee Cipriano. Renee, I hope Governor Ryan gives you a raise after he signs this Bill, because you certainly deserve it. And with that, I certainly ask my colleagues to approve this historic piece of legislation."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Final speaker is Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Let me first address some of the concerns that were raised by Members of the House... by Representative McCarthy. There is no cost to the state for this program, none whatsoever. Not one penny of General Revenue Funds, not one penny of state dollars. This is all being done through a revenue neutral proposal. And I'll talk about my good friend John Stevens in BOB in a moment. So, there is no cost to the taxpayers, there is no cost to the state. This is all being done in the future with financing mechanisms that are revenue neutral. Secondly, Representative of Peoria, Representative Slone, questioned the older plants. No, there is nothing in this Bill that says these old plants have to go on offline. However, given market conditions, once new plants come online with cleaner air, cleaner quality energy, at some point, it could encourage the older plants to go offline because of the cost involved. That is a long-term economic strategy. Now, let me address briefly the new generation capacity issue. We expect the demand in Illinois over the course of the next ten years, we will need 1100 megawatts each year in new generation capacity over the next ten years, Some people have talked about, we don't need new energy generation. They say there are thousands and thousands Well, unfortunately, a lot of those megawatts available. megawatts, as my friends in the suburbs know, are the result of peaker plants that are under construction, peaker plants that are drawing out the groundwater, using millions of gallons of water every day. Those are the things we've become reliant upon for our energy needs. And they are only used on peak times during the course of the year. We

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

can't have a long-term energy strategy that relies on It's not good for the suburbs. It's not peaker plants. good for the environment long-term, and it's not good for the people of this state. When we first started this initiative last summer, we had three goals in mind. first was to increase the use of Illinois coal. Secondly, we wanted to improve the air quality of this state. finally, we wanted to create greater generation so we would become energy independent and not become overly reliant on out-of-state generation like California. During the course of last summer, during the course of last fall, and during the course of this spring, we had numerous meetings trying to achieve consensus on a long-term comprehensive We reached out to the unions. We reached out to We reached out to the the utilities. environmental community. We reached out to the administration. House Bill 63. Unfortunately, partisanship became proposal, involved, Representative Daniels had his Representative Reitz had his. But the bottom line is this, thanks to the Governor and his leadership, we have crafted a comprehensive energy package at no cost to the state. This is the most important piece of legislation for Southern Illinois in three decades. And we have George Ryan and his people to thank. But let me also name a couple of other people who have been involved behind the scenes. Steve Schnorf at BOB, and Kim Fowler and our good friend, John Stevens, Mike Murphy, Mona Martin, and Dan Keefe of DCCA, Keith Staats of Revenue, others from the EPA and the Department of Natural Resources, and all of our friends here in this chamber, Republican and Democrat, Representative Bost, Representative Jones, Representative Moore, Representative Daniels, our good friends on this

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

side of the aisle, Phil Novak, Dan Reitz, Jim Fowler, Gary Forby, Judy Erwin, who was involved in crafting some of the environmental provisions, which are significant in this They've been overlooked. There are significant environmental provisions included in this Bill. Illinois will be the first state in the country that could increase air quality standards... the first state, the only state... certain findings are met. We ramp up the mandated use of renewable fuels in this Bill. That hasn't been discussed. This is a very proenvironment Bill. This is a proenvironment package. We balanced the needs of the environmental community with those of the industry and the That's what this Bill reflects. everyone's interest and tried to draft a cohesive, comprehensive, consensus-building policy. And we have the Governor to thank for that because he took components from every caucus: House Republicans, Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, and the House Democrats. This is a comprehensive package, and I want to thank the Governor. As has been mentioned, without his leadership, I don't know if we would be here today. And thanks to him and thanks to all the Members, we have this Bill before us. I also want to thank Pam McDonough. And I also want to thank Renee They were put in a very, very difficult Cipriano. position, but they showed their true professionalism. worked on a bipartisan package. And that's what we have before us today. Ladies and Gentlemen, with your vote today, you are going to create thousands of good-paying jobs, you are going to provide new, clean energy for all the people of this state, and you're going to assure energy independence for our families for decades to come. Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to thank all of you for helping

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

us. We are all part of this. This is how good public policy is formulated. This is a very, very good Act. We believe the Illinois Resources Development and Energy Security Act is the Act for all of Illinois and for all of the people of Illinois. Thank you for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, look at the coal counties in Illinois by this map. The blue are current coal counties and there's significant numbers of Illinois is coal rich. Illinois needs this Bill to pass and become law. Representative Granberg said it well, and I commend him for his actions on this. This Bill doesn't require taxpayer dollars. Yes, we use incentive and revenue bonds and bonds that are revenue neutral make sure that we do what we need to do to revitalize the coal industry to produce the energy. This creates jobs: coal jobs, construction jobs, transportation jobs, and building new power plants sets up an energy independence from western coal, which we have been dependent on for so long. It eliminates the need for power plan... peaker And the opportunity is boundless to attract new business and industry all done without a single taxpayer dollar needed to be utilized for this purpose. Join me, join Representative Granberg, Jones, Bost, as well as Representative Tenhouse and Representative Reitz and all the others that worked so hard on this legislation to make that we empower Illinois. Go coal, and power Illinois. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1599?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1599. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like to make an announcement. It is the Chair's intention to work 'til about 6:30 this evening. Prior to that at about 6:00 p.m., pizza will be delivered to the House Floor for the Members. And we will go to committee at 6:30 and then come back to the floor. Representative May, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

- May: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the last Bill my button was stuck and

 I didn't register a 'yes' vote. I wish to be registered

 'yes'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will reflect your wishes on House Bill 1599. House Bill 3188, Representative Hassert for a Motion."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2. And a Conference Committee Report is requested. Senate Bill 20, Representative Coulson. Beth Coulson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 103, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 103 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Granberg, has been approved for consideration."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Granberg on Amendment #2."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 just makes substantive changes to the rural mass transit districts in downstate Illinois. That would allow them... because they've added counties to the regions that they serve that would allow them, potentially, to receive more money. This is merely the substantive language. There is no appropriation with this. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill

103?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed

'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 103, a Bill for an Act amending the Downstate Public Transportation Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 103 simply has the language that Representative Granberg explained as amended with the rural... Has the language he explained along with the Bill, the same language that we passed out earlier this year that deals with the downstate rural mass transit districts, both in mine and Representative Fowler's district. And I'd just appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 103?' All those in favor signify by voting

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 103. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1285, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We have an Amendment, I believe, Amendment 5... 4."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1285 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "But I believe there are later Amendments. I believe I want to withdraw that one."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Is there also a 4?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Currie: "Then I'd like to withdraw 3."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "And if I can ask the Clerk, is that the last one? Okay,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

then we'll go with Amendment #4. This is the Amendment that incorporates the agreement that brought Corporate Headquarters to Chicago and to the State of Illinois. You've read a lot about it in the newspaper. think everyone feels kind of proud that Boeing would choose us and everybody does believe that not only in terms of our image as a city and state but in terms of the revenues that Boeing will spend in the State of Illinois in the City of Chicago, it's altogether a win situation for us. This measure incorporates the agreements between the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and Boeing and between the City of Chicago and Boeing in order to make this relocation happen. You should know that much of financial incentives that the state will provide Boeing are already incorporated in current law. Boeing will be eligible for tax credits under EDGE, Economic Development for a Growing Economy, a measure passed two years ago by this Assembly and signed by the Governor. In addition, Boeing will be entitled to apply for a fair number of grant programs, high impact business, job training and so forth. Programs that already operate under the auspices of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Two things are new in this legislation. One is the creation of the Corporate Headquarters Relocation Act. Under that measure Boeing would be eligible for a total of \$8.6 million to pay for the costs of moving the company over a ten-year period. That money would in fact reflect half of the total individual income tax payments made by Boeing employees, new money for the state revenue chest. And in addition, the Corporate Relocation Act would extend the opportunity for a company to participate in the EDGE tax credit by an additional five years. Finally, the Bill incorporates the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

agreement between the city and Boeing that the city would be able to rebate property taxes for Boeing over a 20 year period but clarifies, as the agreement itself stipulates that the school children will not be affected by the rebate. That is to say, none of the dollars that otherwise would go to schools out of those property taxes will be affected, will be spent. So that's the agreement. We've taken the actual language of the agreement between Boeing and the state, Boeing and Chicago. We hold harmless the school children against the property tax rebate and Boeing having committed that it would only access 60% of the existing EDGE tax credit and only 60% of the extended credit, that language is incorporated in Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1285. In addition, the extended EDGE tax credit, the Corporate Relocation Act will sunset in four years time. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady will yield."

Morrow: "Representative Currie, I asked you this question in caucus, but I want to get this on record. As part of the incentives for Boeing, the Chicago public school system will not build a separate school for the kids of the employees of Boeing?"

Currie: "Not to my knowledge. There's no plan of that sort on the drawing boards or anywhere close."

Morrow: "My second question, is there an idea or would you have an answer of how many minority or female employees are gonna be relocated from Seattle to Chicago?"

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Currie: "I do not know and in fact, I don't know that anybody knows which current employees plan to relocate and which positions will be available for filling from people who live in the Chicago metropolitan area."

Morrow: "So you wouldn't know at this moment how many employees of Boeing in Seattle are either African American or female?"

Currie: "Or Asian American. No, I do not..."

Morrow: "Or any minority."

Currie: "I don't have that list."

Morrow: "All right. Has Boeing signed a pledge to increase the diversity of its workforce, if we pass this Bill?"

Currie: "I don't know its corporate policies, Representative, but

I can't believe they would choose to come to Chicago in

Illinois without a commitment to affirmative action. I

believe that is the corporate character."

Morrow: "Thank you."

Currie: "But I have nothing in writing on that point."

Morrow: "Thank you, Representative Currie. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Miller."

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Miller: "Representative, I've read or heard a report in which that the... that Boeing may not be... not use all the tax incentives offered by the state and by the City of Chicago. How does this legislation, if they do not use that, how will that be affected?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question."

Miller: "If they do not... if they decide not to use our entire package that you are requesting here in incentives, what

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

changes, if any, will be made to our incentive package? For instance, if they don't use it all, is there any way we can use these funds or this incentive somewhere else besides..."

Currie: "Yes."

Miller: " ... for this project?"

Currie: "Sure, as I say, some of the incentives they would take advantage of are incentives that are already part of State

Law available to any large company that were to relocate..."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear."

Currie: " ... in Illinois."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh, thank you."

Miller: "I'm sorry, go ahead. Could you repeat the answer?"

Currie: "The answer was that, of course, many companies are eligible for incentives already on the books. If they don't take advantage of them, they're available for other enterprises or they revert to the General Revenue Fund. Boeing is already committed, and that's incorporated in this legislation, that it will use only 60% of what it could be eligible for under the existing EDGE tax credit and will only use 60% of what would be available under the extension of the EDGE credit. We've incorporated that commitment in this language."

Miller: "So the remaining 40% then can be used, you're saying, can be used for any other businesses or any other entities or..."

Currie: "Or it would stay in the General Revenue Fund, available for other distribution."

Miller: "Okay. In relationship to the number of jobs, I couldn't hear how many jobs were to be relocated, or any estimate?"

Currie: "About 500."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Miller: "About 500?"

Currie: "Um hmm."

Miller: "And what is the estimate of auxiliary jobs that could be generated from Boeing?"

Currie: "Well, that number is substantial. They already are using many suppliers in the State of Illinois. It's expected that they may well use more advertising, more legal, more other goods and services from local vendors once they are headquartered here. There also is the possibility that Boeing will branch out into other kinds of corporate endeavors and it certainly would be hoped that if they do so branch out that they might choose to do so in the near locality."

Miller: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, how much will the state lose in revenue?"

Currie: "One could argue zero. The only new money in this program is the \$8.6 million over ten years, about \$800 thousand a year, that Boeing would be eligible for in the recoupment of the moving costs. But that number will be that number if and only if half of the individual income tax payments by these 500 Boeing employees are paid to the State of Illinois and are available for these relocation purposes."

Davis, M.: "I heard you say that the city... The schools would not lose any money even though the schools do get some funding from property tax."

Currie: "There's a separate issue in the Bill and that is that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the City of Chicago has agreed to a 20-year rebate of property taxes paid of the corporate headquarters. But that rebate will not apply against property tax dollars that would otherwise go to the schools. The schools will not rebate the property tax."

Davis, M.: "So the portion that will go to schools will continue to go to schools and the other portion will be rebated."

Currie: "Right."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Currie: "In fact the city... the city will rebate the total but will hold harmless the public schools, so that school kids will not lose out because property taxes will not come in."

Davis, M.: "Do you know if there are... Will they do hiring of people that live and reside in Chicago or in the State of Illinois? Or are they bringing all of their people with them?"

Currie: "I would imagine not all of their people will want to come. You know, if they've got 500 corporate headquarters employees, I would think that some of them might decide that they'd rather stay in Seattle. I can't imagine anybody preferring Seattle, but there may be a few benighted souls among the Boeing corporate crew who for whatever reason choose not to make the move and I would imagine that then local people would be, certainly, eligible to qualify for hiring."

Davis, M.: "Representative, is it a precedent or is it unprecedented for us to give someone a 20-year tax, you know, break?"

Currie: "I believe it has happened before."

Davis, M.: "Which company?"

Currie: "No, I don't know what the... I know that the total dollar value of the Arlington Park Racetrack property tax

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

abatement would be a lot higher than this."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I've read many pieces of literature and information that state bringing Boeing to Chicago and the State of Illinois will increase business for a number... about 27 other businesses, including the fact that perhaps their employees will be doing business with other entities in our city and in our state. However, I have grave concerns about a 20-year tax break. I will support this issue, but I will be watching with a jaundiced eye as to the benefits that our city and that our state actually receive. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just speak to this legislation in a regional issue. We've heard today that we are going to do some very positive things for the coal industry in Southern Illinois and now we are working with Boeing in the City of Chicago to provide economic development in the City of Chicago. One of my concerns is that the population, the way it's divided in our state, is 45 or 43% of the population resides in the collar counties. And I want us to be mindful that we can't ignore the and interests of the collar counties. concerns introduce... and what brings this home to me, is that introduced House Bill 282, which passed this House unanimously, which would have provided communities, especially in Lake County, the ability to have enterprise zones, which would be exactly what we're talking about with Boeing, and that's tax incentives, to attract businesses. While that Bill passed this House unanimously,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

it was never called in the Senate. And so it's a concern to me that while I support what we're doing for the coal industry and I support what we're doing for Boeing and the City of Chicago, I think we must be very mindful of where our population is growing dramatically and how important these kinds of initiatives would also be to the collar counties, and we can't forget what their concerns are. I will support this initiative. I applaud all the people that worked on it. But I do have a concern that we tend to focus these kinds of initiatives in the City of Chicago and really downstate and we need to be much more mindful of what's going on in our growing collar counties."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Barbara, I understand what you're trying to do here.

I'm wondering, in this package that you're proposing, are there any guarantees that if Boeing does not do what they say they're going to do, or if any company... and I know this isn't just for Boeing, the way this is written, that if any company that relocates here doesn't do what they say they're going to do, that they would have to pay back the incentives and the grants?"

Currie: "It doesn't say so here, but I believe you passed legislation earlier this Session that would constrain businesses from taking advantage of tax breaks and then walking."

Franks: "That was one of my..."

Currie: "'Cause that would be... that would be overarching. We didn't include it specifically in here because... And there

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

will, of course, be provisions in the contracts that DCCA signs with the company that would provide precisely that."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you, I appreciate that. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This Body passed Senate Bill 603, unanimously, approximately three weeks ago, which is the Corporate Accountability Act, which would require corporations, that receive state tax incentives and grants, to enter into written contracts. What I am worried about is what happened to our taxpayers with the Motorola deal, where they got \$60 million in tax breaks and incentives and then fired half the workforce in McHenry County and sent those jobs to Mexico. I want to make sure that if this passes today, that concurrently, while I know the Governor wants to sign this Bill, that he also signs into law Senate Bill 603. So that way, that all of these agreements will have to be in contract form, have to be in writing and to protect the citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield. Shhh, please."

Black: "Representative Currie, it's so hard to hear in here. I believe I heard you say you have crafted this in such a way that the normal property tax abatement that schools are asked to give up has not been done in this case. The Chicago Public Schools will continue to receive their property tax share or whatever school district is involved in this site."

Currie: "It is the Chicago Public Schools. Under this language, we will guarantee that the schools get every cent of the property tax they would otherwise be entitled to. That was actually part of the agreement between Boeing and the City

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

of Chicago, but I thought it was important for our sense of security to make sure that it is part of the legislation we adopt."

Black: "I thank you very much for that, Representative. that's an excellent job that you've done. Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment which becomes the Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a downstater it would be very easy for me to get up and pontificate against this because one could say, well, gee whiz, there isn't anything in this for Central Illinois. Nothing is further from the truth. Had Boeing decided to locate in my legislative district, any city in my legislative district, I would have crawled over here on my hands and knees to beg the Governor and the Members of this General Assembly for any incentive package that it required to bring a Fortune 500 company to Unfortunately, we're not Legislative District. configured to be the host of a company like Boeing. But I would submit to my downstate colleagues, Boeing did over \$600 million worth of business last year in the State of Illinois. I would hope that they... their relocation to the Chicago Metro area might encourage some of suppliers to look to Illinois. And I would hope that some of those suppliers who may now currently be on the West Coast or the East Coast to look at downstate Illinois. And can assure you, that I will do everything I can for any of those suppliers, for any reasonable incentive to locate. That is the business environment that we are in today, whether you like it or not. Without Governor Ryan's EDGE tax credit program, which we have used in my district on three separate occasions. One of it was responsible... One of those tax credits was responsible for a \$40 million expansion of a Quaker Oats plant in the City of Danville,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

an event which was the best news we've had in a decade. We've used that EDGE credit to attract a state-of-the-art roofing material plant to be built by Owen Corning Fiberglass doing business as Fibertech, that is currently under construction. We needed the EDGE tax credit. tried to pass it in this General Assembly years ago. commend the Governor for doing it. The State of Indiana has had an EDGE tax credit for a decade, and would often take businesses away from Illinois. So regardless of your feelings about Boeing or where they located or where they didn't locate, the bottom line is, on some issues I can be just as provincial and regional as anybody in this chamber, but this Bill, as crafted, is good for Illinois. you live north, central or south, it's a good Bill, a reasonable Bill to attract a major company that I might point out, in 1999 contributed almost \$20 million to charity in the State of Washington. They contributed about \$386 thousand to charitable causes in Illinois. Maybe we can reverse that. The 19 or 20 million will be spent on charitable causes in Illinois and the 400 thousand will be spent in Washington. This is a good idea. finely-crafted economic package, and it's good for Illinois; I don't care where you live. And I intend to vote 'aye' and if you'll let me, I'll vote 'aye' twice."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Fritchey: "I think it's tremendous that we have Boeing coming to Chicago. I wish we had 500 of the Fortune 500 companies coming to relocate in this state. I got sent down here like everybody else to represent my constituents. And the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

message from my constituents was to give them some relief. Give them property tax relief. Get some things done for them this year. I have a lot of respect for the people involved in the negotiation of the Boeing package, people from the city, people from the state, people from DCCA, the Legislators involved. If we could spend that same time and effort doing things for our people back home, then I'd feel much better doing this. If we were coming home with a budget that did things for people back in the neighborhood, then I'd be okay with doing this. If we had a budget that did things for our families that live here for years, opposed to 500 families that are moving here now, then I'd feel better about voting for this Bill. We're tens of millions of dollars here, hundreds of millions of dollars on other projects coming up tonight. We're looking out for everybody else but the people we got sent down here for. Will we have economic benefit from this down the road? Yeah, we might have that down the road. But I'm not gonna be able to explain that to the families that are being pushed out of their homes because they can't afford the increases in their property taxes. I do not want to go back to my district and tell them that I did nothing for them on the issues of importance to them, what they sent me down here to do, what they asked me to do, but I helped to bring corporate welfare and corporate nameplates down to Illinois, down to Chicago. It doesn't make sense. It's not the right thing to do. I'm not gonna do it. you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. Not to directly contradict, but to take a different take on it from the previous speaker. I

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

rise in strong support of this Amendment and this Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a huge win for the State of Illinois. We are all connected. When the farm economy in this state is not doing well, we are not doing well in the City of Chicago. When the manufacturing industry doesn't do well in one part of the state, residents in Lake County don't do as well. We are all connected in 102 counties. The fact that the competent work that was done and the excellent work that was done by the Mayor of Chicago, by our Governor, by our competent and great Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Pam McDonough, the work that we did to attract them was tremendous. This is a huge win, and it should be a credit to each of you that work year after year to try and improve public education, try and take advantage of diverse and talented workforce that we have in this state, in every part of this state, as well as outstanding research universities, colleges, community colleges. This is why Boeing picked Chicago and Illinois. It is a major You should be very proud of it and we should be excited that a multinational company that will further Illinois's future in a global economy, has chosen to be here. I am really proud of the work that's been done. urge all of us to support this. I think it is a great addition to the state economy. It's looking to the future of where Illinois can be and should be in a global international economy. We don't want to be left behind. We want to be in front of the parade. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Mulligan: "Representative Hamos and I both serve on the workforce investment board and one of the things that we're looking at there is how to attract business and make the best workforce that we can. One of the things that's most obvious from all statistics that in 15 years in this country, we will have more retired people than we have people that are working. States that attract business and have a workforce and companies here will support their residents where other states won't. To prepare now for that future of 15 years, when we have more people retired than we have working, Illinois must be competitive and invite business and best education and best of t.he workforce to be here in Illinois. What we need to do is to continue to work to have companies like Boeing move here. We should put those incentives forward and we should be ready for the future years to support our residents who are going to number many retirees and have a lot of people that are working. I would urge an 'aye' vote for this."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Crotty."

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I listened to many of the discussions here on the Boeing company. I don't think anyone is saying that we do not want Boeing or any other large corporation to make their home here in the State of Illinois. But I remember last year, when we gave a small property tax increase to the residents in the State of Illinois and after I got home I realized, I'm getting a few calls from my senior citizen constituents, that they in fact did not get anything. And we came back and we passed a Bill and we had a lot of discussion on what's fair and what's not fair. And to this day, those seniors, who absolutely needed some property tax

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

relief, got nothing. So when I look at a corporation getting 20 years, 20 years of tax relief, and I couldn't get some of my seniors one year of a tax relief, when I look at \$52 million to a corporation to come here, when I know that some of my small businesses in southern Cook are closing because they could not get any tax relief, and for those reasons I'm gonna vote 'no' on this Bill. Because I've heard from the people that have asked me to come here to Springfield for the same thing that we are giving to a large corporation, but my constituents needed a far more smaller scale of relief. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recog...

Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment and I compliment the Sponsor, I compliment the Governor and I compliment DCCA for their fine efforts in recruiting Boeing to Illinois. Although I would have much rather have seen them come to Schaumburg, their choice of Chicago and the State of Illinois is excellent. Perhaps in the future we can have more incentives for them and they'll be able to bring some of their manufacturing to this state and we'll continue to enhance our economy. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Delgado: "Just briefly, and I want to pick up where the eloquent presentation by Representative Fritchey... When... We know this package will have some wings today. But we also say that if Boeing also got a big break on its cit... on utility tax and we'll call on Boeing to donate its savings

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

from that utility tax and donate it to the Energy Assistance Fund. That will take care... a lot of gas prob... gas bills, to make sure that people are to be able to stay in their homes, and to be able to keep themselves warm also. So, we gotta make that appeal. That if you're gonna come in and we're gonna continue to provide these corporate welfare packages, they should be incentives to the communities and make sure that they're able to then be responsible and keep som... and take some of that savings and pass it on to our consumers who are being strangled right now, even in summer, trying to pay their gas bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Okay. Speaker, I've just been informed that this

Amendment is not yet on the system, so in fact we can't

vote on it at this moment. But I would hope that when we

come back to it, once it is on the system, that we don't

have to say anything at all, just vote 'yes' or 'no'."

Speaker Hartke: "So, we'll take this Bill out of the record."

Currie: "Thank..."

Speaker Hartke: "Is the Amendment on the computer on the Democrat side? Republicans claim they have theirs. Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "I think if you... On our side of the aisle, on our system anyway, it's out of order. It appears in the comments section. Floor Amendment #4 is on the analysis and I thought I saw a paper copy of it floating around here just a while ago. Maybe I'm mistaken. No paper copy? Oh, well then we might as well adjourn and come back next week. I mean, is..."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The Bill's out of the record, we'll come back to it..."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: " ... Representative Black, I'm sure. Rules

Committee Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration for a Motion to recede' from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 76; 'recommend for adoption' House Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 113; 'Motion to recede' from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 839; 'recommendation for adoption' for House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1285; 'direct floor consideration' for House Resolution 427; 'Motion to concur' with Amendment #1 to House Bill 2157; 'Motion to concur' with Amendment #1 to House Bill 2367; and 'Motion to concur' with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 2432."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1282, on House Amendment #4.

Representative O'Brien... Senate Bill 1282."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1282, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee.

Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative O'Brien, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 becomes the Bill and what it would do is, it would allow for a community of... that is trying to annex property that is contiguous with the Illinois River, the Kankakee River, the... I believe the DuPage River and the I & M National Heritage Corridor, that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

they wouldn't have to get the permission of the Department of National Resources in order to annex. It would be considered contiguous for the purposes of annexation. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield? Representative,

I yield to your legal expertise. I noticed that this
annexation procedure is currently in the courts and as I
look at Floor Amendment #4, while I'm certainly no expert,
could this not be construed as narrowly drafted special
legislation that the court may not look favorably upon?"

O'Brien: "I'm not aware that it would be considered such special legislation, because one of the questions that came up in committee was, this could apply to communities like Peoria, that are on the Illinois River. It could apply to other places and that was something that was brought up. So I'm not aware of that. And certainly, I think when the Municipal League took a look at it, they thought that maybe it was broader than they would have liked to have seen it. So, I hope that that's not going to be a concern because that's not my intention."

Black: "Oh, okay. Fine, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussions? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1282?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1282, a Bill for an Act in relation to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

territory annexations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Move it to Third. Are we ready?"

Speaker Hartke: "It is on Third."

- O'Brien: "Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As before, I said Floor

 Amendment #4 became the Bill and I would just ask for a
 favorable vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1282?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1282, there were 92 Members voting 'yes', 21 Members voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1282. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1285, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1285, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #4?

 We just went through an hour of discussion. Hearing none,

 the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4

 to Senate Bill 1285?' Yes, Sir, Mr. Black."
- Black: "I was just going to ask you to correct the board. There you go. It had the Sponsor wrong. It was throwing us off, we thought it was the other Bill. You had Amendment #4, O'Brien. But it's correct now because of the outstanding

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

effort of the Clerk."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. Representative Currie."

Currie: "That I just move adoption of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1285."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor

Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1285?' All those in favor

signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1285, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1282, would you put me down for voting 'yes' please?"

Speaker: "The Journal will reflect that your real wish is voting 'yes'."

Yarbrough: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on 1285? Seeing that no one... The Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

Franks: "To the Bill, Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Franks: "I've anguished over this Bill, because I know how important it is to bring business to Illinois, especially one of the stature of Boeing. And I certainly think that Boeing is going to be a net benefit for the State of Illinois, and I'm glad they're here. And I think it's important that the state does provide incentives for Boeing and other corporations like that to come here. But I'm gonna vote 'no' today on this Bill for a couple of reasons. Number one, I want to make sure that Senate Bill 603

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

passes, so everything that... whenever we enter into agreements with corporations that they're gonna be in writing, as the taxpayers are also protected. The second reason I'm gonna vote 'no' is because I think it's a question of priorities. When I've learned today, when I'm reading the budget, that our retired teachers are going to have a 45% premium increase on their health insurance and these are teachers, that have been here for 30 and 40 years, who taught each and every one of us, who created the future and the reasons that why we're here are our teachers. And we can't get some money to help our teachers, but we can spend \$40 million somewhere else. think it's time to revaluate our priorities, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm glad Boeing's coming here, but I think that we also have to take care of the people that have taken care of us. And that's why, regrettably, I have to stand in opposition."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I won't belabor the point. Nothing gives an individual more worth, self-worth, dignity, and the ability to pay the very taxes that the previous speaker was talking about that will help our schools and help our infrastructure and help our state. Nothing does that like a job. And you know, the state doesn't really create jobs, it's the private sector. Thev create the jobs. They meet the payrolls. They, they... Those employees pay the taxes. I only wish this was coming to the 105th Legislative District, but that's not to be, but at least it's coming to Illinois. And to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who said there was no property tax relief, and they couldn't go back home without it. Well, I've got an Amendment pending in Rules that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

would grant a homestead exemption, a \$1 thousand increase and put us on the same plane as Cook County, but I can't get it out of Rules. I've got a 90-day suspension of the State of Illinois gasoline tax, not sales tax, gasoline tax, a 90-day suspension. It cost \$300 million. We could afford it. Won't let it out of Rules. Sometimes we want it both ways around here. But on the Boeing package, I hope some of those suppliers locate in the 105th Legislative District, we'll welcome them with open arms. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Mr.

Miller. Representative Miller."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Miller: "I don't think the argument here today is whether it's attractive for Illinois to... to have Boeing come or not. I mean, who wouldn't want Boeing, a Fortune 500 company, in our own backyard. I certainly would. But I think what we're talking about here is the issue of priorities. I mean it's hard for me to go back to my district and say we, that we approved... that I voted for incentives for another rich company that's doing well, that did well before they got here, when we have issues of family care, we have issues of the uninsured, we have issues of our streets, our roads, our schools that we have to deal with here. And so, we have to weigh that out to try to say, look, I know that Boeing is kinda important, important to our community, that they may bring ancillary jobs to us, but ultimate, we have to answer to the citizens and the residents of Illinois. And so, with that in mind and with that spirit in mind, I say... I think we should relook at this and vote 'no' until our issues on this state

- 69th Legislative Day

 are addressed fully and adequately with funding that we need."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Hartke: "The move of the question is put. All those is favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thanks, Speaker and Members of the House. Just remember that, for all you can inflate the value of this legislation, all that is new here, all that we're offering that is not already available to any business that comes to the State of Illinois is about 800 thousand a year over ten years, paid for by the new income tax that comes to this state, because of the relocation of those 500 employees. Boeing is a jewel in the crown of the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1285?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 102 Members voting 'yes', 8 Members voting 'no', 6 Members voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1285. And this piece of legislation, received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2911, Representative Biggins. Representative Biggins on Senate Amendment #1."
- Biggins: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'm a little occupied at the moment. And I... I have House Bill 2911 which is, basically, a remap... a new map of the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

districts comprising the board of review in Cook County. The current board of review was created in a Public Act in 1996 and the current map has to be redrawn to conform with redistricting. This is the product of that effort. It has been reviewed by lawyers who assure me that the Bill is in conformity with the Constitution of the State of Illinois, of the United States, and also the Voting Rights Act. Also, the three commissioners and the Board of Review in Cook County have approved this map and agreed on it. That would be Chairman Berrios, Commissioner Shaw and Commissioner Murphy. The only difference between this map and the current map is just a reflection. There is slight geo... boundary changes which'll reflect the changes in population. And I'll be happy to answer any questions anyone would have on it."

Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion on House Bill 2911 and Senate Amendment? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2911?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2911. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 29... 2595 on concurrence. Mr. Turner, Art Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur with Senate Amendments 1 to House Bill 2595. They're basically cleanup... it's basically cleanup language that was presented to me from the Department of Registration. And what it does is, it

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

spells out qualifications in terms of renewal regarding optometrists who would like to have their license reinstated or restored as a result of military services. It spells out that they will have to have continuing education in order to make this happen. And both these Sections, as I say, was given to me by the Department and we move for the concurrence of these Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

 Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Senate Bill 1285, I wish the record to reflect that I wish to have been recorded as voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The record will so reflect. Is there any discussion on the Senate Amendment #1? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? MΥ. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 118, Representative Morrow. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 118, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Morrow, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Morrow on Amendment #2."

Morrow: "Yes, yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Gentlemen of the House. What Floor Amendment #2 does is increases the number of judges that we have in the state by about 42. And I'm gonna read some of the circuits where we are increasing judges: 2nd Appellate District, which is the suburbs of Chicago and northern Illinois, would get two, two judges for the Appellate Court. The 4th Appellate District, which is central Illinois, would get one Appellate judge. The 5th Appellate District, which is southern Illinois, would get one Appellate judge. The 3rd Circuit, which covers Madison and Bond Counties, would get one resident judge. The 4th Circuit covers Clinton, Marion, Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Montgomery, Christian, Shelby, and Jasper, would get two associate judges. 9th Circuit, Hancock, McDonough, Fulton, Knox, Warren, Henderson Counties, would get one associate judge. 12th Circuit... excuse me, the 12th Circuit, which is Will County, would get three resident judges, one associate judge and by operation of law, the 12th Circuit will receive an additional four... four Circuit judges under the 2000 census. The 13th Circuit, LaSalle and Grundy would get one, Circuit judge, 14th Circuit, Henry, Whiteside, Mercer, Rock Island, would get one Circuit judge. The 16th Circuit, Kane, DeKalb and Kendall, one resident judge Kane, one resident judge from DeKalb, one resident judge Kendall and one associate judge. The 17th Circuit, two judges, 18th Circuit, three resident judges and Circuit three associates. The 19th Circuit, four resident The 20th Circuit, which is St. Clair, Washington, Monroe, Randolph and Perry Counties, would get one resident judge. In Cook County there are 15 judges, resident judges for the 15 subcircuits, and Cook COunty would also get 15 associate judges. I'd be glad to answer any questions on Senate Bill

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

118, and I'm... and before we go into that, I also want to let you know that in the 12th Circuit, the 18th Circuit, and the 19th Circuit, those Circuits would become subcircuits and the 12th Circuit, which is Will County, will be divided into five subcircuits. The 18th Circuit, which is DuPage County, will be divided into six subcircuits. And the 19th subcircuit (sic-Circuit), which is Lake and McHenry Counties, will be divided into six subcircuits. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "Representative, are you serious about this Bill?"

Morrow: "Representative Cross, I'm serious about every Bill that has my name on it as a Sponsor, and that's being called."

Cross: "Can you tell us what a subcircuit is?"

Morrow: "A subcircuit is like a legislative district. It has a certain number of residents that live in these subcircuit. It has boundaries. And just like we have to live in our legislative district to run... to run as a... to be considered for a judge in a subcircuit, you have to live in that subcircuit's district."

Cross: "Do we have subcircuits here in the State of Illinois?"

Morrow: "Yes. We created subcircuits in Cook County about ten years ago."

Cross: "Why did we... Did the General Assembly create the subcircuits or did the courts?"

Morrow: "The General Assembly created the subcircuits and it is within the Constitution of the State of Illinois, if you look at Article VI, Section 7 says Ju... Ju... Judicial Circuits. If you look at Sections A, B, and C, we have

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the... we have the authorization to set up subcircuits within a county. With the help of your side of the aisle, this was before your time, Representative Cross. With the help of your side of the aisle, we in the African-American community wanted to increase the number of minority judges and we fought to create a subcircuit in Cook County."

Cross: "It seemed like a... seems like a good idea, doesn't it Charles, to do that in Cook County? Is that... That was the idea back at 10 or 15 years ago?"

Morrow: "I'm sorry, Representative Cross, I couldn't hear that last question."

Cross: "Seemed like... Seems like it was a good idea to do that in Cook County to take care of the concerns you had. No one's disputing the need for subcircuits at Cook County, are they? No one has."

Morrow: "Is that... is that a comment or is that a question, Representative?"

Cross: "I guess... Well, I guess I'll ask the question. No one has argued about the need for subcircuits at Cook County.

It's really been ended up being a good idea."

Morrow: "That's correct."

Cross: "And who came to you with the idea to create subcircuits in the collar counties or the circuits you've done in your... that you've created in your Bill? Who... did someone approach you and say, we need to do subcircuits in DuPage County?"

Morrow: "Well, the thought was that with the shift in the census, in the census 2000, it shows that the growth has gone into Lake County, and DuPage County and Will County. You have a more diverse of citizenship in those counties and I felt... we felt that the creation of the subcircuits would create the change in the diversity in those counties."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Cross: "So, is this your idea, Charles, or did someone come to you and say, we really need to do this in those respective counties?"
- Morrow: "Why are you so hung up on who came up with this idea, Representative?"
- Cross: "Well, I'm just trying to figure out who's pushing it."
- Morrow: "Well, I'm pushing it. 'Cause for the last three years,
 I've been working on increasing judges statewide. And one
 day, I said well, we need to bring some diversity into
 DuPage, Lake, McHenry, and Will. Just like ten years ago,
 your side of the aisle argue, we need to bring some
 diversity to the bench in Cook County."
- Cross: "I guess I'm still a little puzzled. Did judges from Lake and DuPage and Will come up... come see you and say, Charles, we need subcircuits in the... our counties."
- Morrow: "Judges from DuPage and Will didn't come to me to ask me to increase the number of judges in those counties."
- Cross: "Did they come to you and say, when we increase judges we also need subcircuits?"
- Morrow: "Since I'm the Sponsor of the Bill, I'm entitled to put the language in the Bill as I see fit."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross, are you finished?"
- Cross: "I think he's right. I agree with him. Have you, by any chance, Representative, talked to Senator Klemm about how he's gonna receive this over in the Senate, assuming... assuming it passes here today?"
- Morrow: "Assuming that it passes, I have talked to Senator Klemm.

 He's given me his concerns about the Bill and I'm sure that once... if this Bill gets to the Senate, Senator Klemm and the rest of the Senators over there, they have an open mind. I've served with a lot of those Senators. A lot of those Senators that are in the Senate now were House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Members when they helped us create the subcircuits in Will... in Cook County. They had an open mind ten years ago and I'm sure many of them still have an open mind ten years later towards subcircuits."

Cross: "Have you given thought... Just a couple of other questions, I know we need to move on. Who's gonna draw the subcircuits? Do you... And I know you're the Sponsor. Do you intend to draw the subcircuits, coming out to Will and drawing them for us?"

Morrow: "Well, Representative Cross, with your help we'll draw the boundaries."

Cross: "Have you given any thought to creating subcircuits in the rest of the state, Charles?"

Morrow: "Well, we'll see how it works in Will and Lake and McHenry for the next ten years and then maybe we'll expand it again, when we... when we look at increasing judges again in ten years. You have to understand, Representative Cross, we haven't had an increase in judges statewide since 1986, and the caseload of judges since 1986 have increased tremendously. The genesis of this Bill, as so far as increasing judges, came from many of the chief judges in these counties. They wanted additional judges to ease the work load of the existing judges that they have now. Now, Representative... go ahead, Representative Cross."

Cross: "You know what, if you're gonna give an answer without a question. I want to hear it."

Morrow: "Well, I was gonna... since you're new around here, there's some language that some people came to me to put in the Bill, called... and he's deceased now, late Senator Frank Savickas, they call it the Frank Savickas language. Where if you serve ten years in the General Assembly, you become an associate judge. If you serve 15 years in the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

General Assembly, you could become a full Circuit judge or an Appellate judge, rather. If you serve 20 years, which I'm very close to, I could be a supreme court judge without... without being a lawyer."

Cross: "So, are you saying..."

Morrow: "I resist... I resisted that language because I didn't want to become a supreme court judge."

Cross: "So, does this mean that Ralph Capparelli is going to the U.S. Supreme Court?"

Morrow: "I think concerning the makeup of the U.S. Supreme Court, Ralph Capparelli would be a better judge than what we have on the bench there now."

Cross: "Well, Representative, I appreciate your intensity and zest with this Bill, you've done a good job and thanks for answering all the questions, even the ones I didn't ask."

Morrow: "Well, Representative, you know they don't call me 'pit bull' for nothing."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes... No one is seeking recognition, Representative Morrow to close."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm so glad... First of all, there's some people that I need to recognize 'cause we've worked on this Bill for three years and want to recognize Dan Houlihan, with the Illinois State Bar for his help. Larry Suffredin with the Chicago State Bar, he's given me tremendous help and the author of the subcircuit, Paul Williams. Without his assistance on this Bill, I couldn't have gotten this accomplished. I want to thank the staff people, Susanne Hack here that has done a tremendous job on this Bill. And I want to thank some of the Members on your side... some Members on your side of the aisle and I'm gonna thank President Pate Philip when he receives this

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Bill in a favorable opinion, he'll call it. I request 'aye' votes on Senate Bill 118."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 118?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. A state mandates note has been requested on the Bill as amended and the note has not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading pending the issuance of the notes. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Conference Committee Report #1 for Senate Bill 629; Conference Committee Report #1 for Senate Bill 1514; and a 'Concurrence Motion to Recede' on the House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20."
- Speaker Hartke: "We done? House Bill 789, Representative McCarthy on a Concurrence Motion."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 789."

Speaker Hartke: "You heard the..."

McCarthy: "It's nonconcur."

Speaker Hartke: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to Nonconcur.

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

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 789.

A Conference Committee Report is requested. Senate Bill 20, Representative Coulson. On a Motion."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Coulson: "The Motion is to recede from House Amendment #2. This would be final action. There's no intention to do anything else to the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "This... this Motion requires a vote. The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Steve Davis, would you like to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Second Reading, on Page 6 on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 479, Representative Murphy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 479, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 479, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Murphy."
- Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 479 simply adds two members to the Cook County Pension Board. Those two members are to be retired members. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "It would appear to us that if Committee (sic-House)

Amendment #1 is on the Bill, this is a shell Bill. Will
the Chair so advise?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. That is the only Amendment that has been adopted to the Bill."

Black: "Fine. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Sponsor if that's his intention?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Black: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Murphy: "Yes, Repres..."

Black: "Representative Murphy, this is now a shell Bill, correct?"

Murphy: "Yes."

Black: "Is it your intent to add language yet, tonight? Or to try to work on it and bring it back in the Fall Veto Session?"

Murphy: "No, to add this language. What happened,

Representative, that we gutted the Bill in committee and my
intentions were to just to add these two members to the
board."

Black: "All right. I appreciate that. Just keep... just keep in mind, that in less than six hours, some of my votes become a lot more important, Representative. So, if we can... we can just draw this out for about another five hours and oh, a few odd minutes, I suddenly... my vote's suddenly worth a lot more energy on June 1st. So, whatever."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the..."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Murphy: "Could I take this Bill out the record for a minute?"

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record. The House will be at ease for five minutes. The Chair recognizes Representative Mendoza. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

oza: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, state your point."

Mendoza: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to draw your attention to a gentleman who we see everyday here in the House. A quiet, humble man who always has a smile and a kind word for all of us. At a time, when I have sometimes wondered, along with some of the other women, is chivalry dead? Pete Croft has proven to me that it is alive and well and in his person. Having said that on behalf of all of my colleagues for whom our Pete has opened doors, delivered messages, or simply offered a pleasant greeting as we do our business in this House. Before we adjourn, we wanted Pete to have his own personal seat in this House, a little more comfortable than the stairs he sometimes sits on. So Pete, with my love and that of colleagues and the respect of all of us, we wish you a great summer, and look forward to seeing you back with us in November. God Bless you, Pete."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just would like to echo Representative Mendoza's sentments... sentiments. Pete... Pete's got to be the best Cub fan that I know in this General Assembly. He tells me everyday when the Cubs win and he's up and when the Cubs are down and when they lose, but Pete... Pete, through thick or thin you're the best, buddy."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Recognizes Representative Righter, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Righter: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Righter: "Mr. Speaker, in the new House Calendar that's been distributed by the Clerk, I noticed that of the matters that we're gonna be hearing later this evening, three of those are House Resolutions. Right now, there are 21 House Resolutions or House Joint Resolutions pending on the Calendar, 14 from your side of the aisle. I've got one and you've got one. I'm wondering if we can get some assurance from the Chair that those will be heard before we adjourn?"

Speaker Hartke: "We'll check on that, Mr. Righter."

Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "What is the status of Senate Bill 1171?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1171 is on... has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #7 has been adopted to the Bill. The notes that were requested on the Bill have been filed."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1171 was the companion Bill to House Bill 914, which previously passed this chamber, except for the fact that we needed to put an Amendment on it; so we waited for Senate Bill 1171 to come over. Since then it has included provisions for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District in Cook County to fund their storm water management plan, which is very important to us suburban Legislators in Cook County and throughout the collar counties in handling flood

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

water management throughout our areas. It also includes the underlying language what was in the Bill, and that is the language which was an initiative of the Illinois Park District Association. We've heard from every park district in the state that how crucial this... this legislation is them. We've got language in there for Lake County, which was sponsored by Representative Andrea Moore and helped along by Representative Mark Beaubien. We have the language in there for Representative Pat Lindner for Kane We have language in there for the Chicago County. Botanical Gardens, which helps them to maintain and keep that area in a maintained environment. And also the language in there for the Brookfield Zoo, which we all know that the zoo services our areas and is a great resource for our children. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Amendment and this Bill. This helps the park districts in my area as well as in some of the areas of northern Illinois. This is something we've worked on, oh, for the last three or four years, ever since the tax caps. happened with the tax caps is, those of you who were here as I was when we enacted them, there was a window of opportunity for some tax cap legislation, but some were not so lucky and the park districts were the people who not so lucky. So, I would ask those who can and will support this... this Bill because it does help the park districts as well as all the other people that Representative Saviano has mentioned. My primary interest in this Bill was with the park districts, but I welcome all the additions. And I do want to thank Representative

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Saviano and Representative Beaubien and Representative Moore who was involved early on, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie and I do appreciate your vote on this Bill, so vote 'aye', thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Saviano to close."
- Saviano: "Mr. Speaker, this is very, very important from my standpoint with the Water Reclamation District. You know, years ago the City of Chicago were able to fund their storm water management plan and the suburban areas were left out. This Bill passes we're able to prevent billions of dollars of damage caused by flooding in our areas. And it's a long time coming and we need that relief. And I would ask for your favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1171?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 54 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1171. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Page 3 on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 78, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 78, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Today I bring to you Senate Bill 78 which is a very simple Bill, although I'm certain if you listen to discussions around the chamber and in the halls you would

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

think that we are about to just reform education in its What Senate Bill 78 does is simply this, it entirety. increases the number of charter schools in the Chicago area from 15, which is the current number, to 30. Charter schools are public schools and is a different approach to education in this state that was approved a few years ago. I have three charter schools in my district, and I can tell you firsthand the impact that it has made on the lives of kids who ordinarily would have been in regular school system who have decided that the charter school was a better approach for them and who are doing very well. This Bill has no dollar impact on the state. Ιt simply authorizes Chicago to okay new charters. In other words, these kids who would be going to charter schools would be kids who would be in the regular public school, if not for that charter school. One of the arguments that I've been hearing from the opponents of the charter schools is, why should we invest in these charter schools when the rest of the system needs so much. And I'd be the first to say that the rest of the system does need a lot, but we have no answer yet, in terms of school reform. There is no one concrete solution in terms of how we should address schools and how we should address the business of trying to educate our children. This is a example that appears to be Certainly, there's no proo... no system that is working. 100% foolproof, but it would safe to say that the majority, and I would say 99% of the charter schools that have come into the existence since the creation of this law are doing I would only add that this Bill again, very, very well. does not deal with the issue of funding for these schools, and in no way deals with building any new schools or taking any money from the existing system. It merely creates 15

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

additional schools. The situation, currently, in Chicago is that we have 13 schools that have already applied for charter and that are currently in existence. The city has granted three additional charters and they're only entitled to two more. And so this would remedy the problem that... that it currently exists in the city, and they are prepared now to move forward and have these schools open. One of the schools that's in the consideration would be located on the north side, one would be on the south side, and one would be on the west sides of the City of Chicago. And I just move for the favorable adoption of Senate Bill 78."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in strong support of Bill 78. For everyone in this chamber who works throughout the year to try and improve the quality of public education and in... improve the opportunities for all children, this is a... this... voting for this Bill will help move that agenda. These are public schools, and I think that it's a great credit to the City of Chicago. I'm not sure we would have ever guessed this when we first passed the Charter School Bill, but I think it's a great credit to the city that they are offering many different types of educational Kids cannot be easily put into a cookie experiences. cutter situation and I'm happy to say that the charter schools really offer a unique opportunity for children and students to stay in the public school system. So, worked in Chicago. I would encourage you to approve Senate Bill 78. The schools that are ready to open are funded. They're ready to go. There are teachers. There are children ready to start in the fall, and I think it is... just a great opportunity to ensure that we keep is

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

advancing public education. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 78, in all due respect to the Sponsor the Bill, who I highly respect, I have to rise in opposition of this piece of legislation and let me tell you the reason why. For the last... I would say for the last three weeks we have in the Elementary and Secondary Education we have spent quite a bit of time debating this issue. And one of the things that I saw that... that the charter school system was going to have to make some changes. And what I did was try to bring all parties on both sides together that had some... some oppositions to the charter school and the group that were a pro charter To make sure that the whole state would benefit from a charter school, which supposedly to have innovative ideas to educate our students in the State of Illinois. And so I tried to bring all groups together. And it was, it was... it was refreshing because it was the first time in a very long time that all the groups came together and to come together and try to debate an issue and try to come to some type of compromise, resolution, or some type of agreement. And I think we made great strides in doing so, and we had a group of individual that set some of their pride aside and... and start looking and focusing in on the students of ... of the State of Illinois. Now, we had combined two pieces of legislation that we thought that will, one, expand the charter schools which 78 does and also in Senate Bill 636, which will give the proper funding or probably more funding for a charter school. And that did not go, because of a lot of reasons, and I don't want

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

to get into all of the reasons, but we did have a compromise. We... we did came to the middle of the road and say that we can both live with these changes. And of course, you know you had one of the issues that it was certifications. You know, and one of the problems is that, know, in the downstate communities 100% of downstate charter school teachers are certified teachers. And you know, that was a problem with some of legislation around... talkin' about round charter school. You know, as we continue to... and what this Bill want to do is expand charter schools in the State of Illinois. know, we must make sure that quality do not suffer, as we continue to do so. And the way we do that, is we began look around us in other communities in other states and find out what they have done in the charter school community, and what results have re... have re... have came about in the charter school system. In Texas and Minnesota and Pennsylvania and Ohio, they were debating and putting moratoriums on the charter school system because something went wrong. There were severe restrictions that was placed on two of the most high profile charter school systems which failed and that left approximately about 200 kids left without... a diploma and... or they had to repeat their grade because something failed in these charter I know in Cook County there was a charter school system. school that did not meet it responsibility and I believe it had to fold because of some reasons. Another issue that we dealt with charter schools was they did not a... want themselves to be unionized, in that they did not want the participation of being organized. And so that became an issue and I think that later on that issue came to a compromise situation. But I think one of the biggest

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

problems that came about, of course, is the funding of these schools. And where would this fund come from and there's only one pot of resources, one trough that we must reach from in order to fund such schools. And, of course, you had a lot of individuals talk about, well, downstate school district or in my upstate school district we only have \$200 per pupil and then the charter school is talking about anywhere from \$500 to \$1000 per pupil. Where... I would like to ask with these schools, where is the commonality? Where is the fairness? Where is the equity? Where is the parity? If we're going to simply allow these schools to educate on such of a level in which we appropriate higher dollars, then they... we re... expect higher results. We expect a total different standard. But yet, they continue to say that we are public school, we are public education. And when you say that then, then you supposed to be under the same auspices of You should have the same the public school system. accountability. You should have the same restrictions as our public school system. They do not have that. And so therefore, they should be held at such of a high standard or high level. And I have not seen it in these schools as of yet. I am all for innovation. I am all for a clear-cut resolution as far as public education, but I cannot in good conscience continue to expand the system that has not reyiel... has not yield the proper results, matched with the proper resources. I haven't seen that. And so, I have to stand here and oppose this legislation because we gave it all the resources... we gave enough debate so that everybody come to the table and come to an agreements and for some reason that legislation is not being called before today. So, therefore, I have to oppose this. Thank us

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Miller."

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Miller: "Representative Turner, you had mentioned that the funding was already there for the charter schools. Where is that funding and where is it coming from? Can you give us a little description on that?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, there currently exists 13 charter schools in the City of Chicago. And right now, the way charter schools exist... the funding for those students is the same funding that follows any other student in District 299, not a nickel more."

Miller: "No... Well, I guess my question centers around... where you're talking about expanding the number... the number of charter schools, you... you've talked about adding... was it 2 additional or 15 additional?"

Turner, A.: "Actually, I'm asking 15... the opportunity for 15 to
 be created in the Chicago area."

Miller: "Okay, so there's 15 additional schools..."

Turner, A.: "Right."

Miller: " ... that will be created."

Turner, A.: "Right."

Miller: "How will..."

Turner, A.: "Not in this one year, but 15..."

Miller: " ... "

Turner, A.: "The possibility of 15 whenever."

Miller: "Where is the funding mechanism coming for these 15 additional schools?"

Turner, A.: "Representative, each one of these schools have their own boards. They're independent boards that help raise

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

funds for the school. In terms of appropriations from the Chicago board, it is the same money that's given to any school on a per pupil basis and in the City of Chicago it would be the same figure that every student gets in a public school versus a charter school in District 299. Now, any additional funds that may be used for infrastructure to help raise that school comes from the board that makes up that particular school. And that varies depending upon who's on the board and what the school's motivation is and what their direction is."

- Miller: "Okay, so... so for instance, if somebody wants to establish a new charter school and they want to create an environment where there... there's very limited walls or open up some spaces, there's gonna be some construction costs to that school, because of that charter school's decision to decide on how they want to teach your school... teach your children on based on that design. Is that correct?"
- Turner, A.: "That's... that's that particular school's responsibility. It's their charge to figure out where they're going to be located and what it takes to get it open."
- Miller: "Okay. So, I'm trying to just really get at the... the funding issue of this. And so, what you're... and so for... Who is gonna pay for the construction or the changing because they deemed that? You're saying that the charter school is."

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

Miller: "Well, where's the money coming... is being derived from?

Is it being derived from the Chicago public schools? Is it being derived from the State Board of Education? Is it being derived from private donors? Is it being derived

- 69th Legislative Day

 from the General Assembly? Where is it... where is it

 derived from?"
- Turner, A.: "It comes from the board of the charter school, and those board members. Some of it may be private. Some of it they may get in bake sales. I mean, it comes from the board. It does not come from the Chicago Board of Ed. It is derived and created through this board of the particular charter school."
- Miller: "Okay, but to expand the... I mean... but I guess it is... and maybe I'm not correct on this."

Turner, A.: "I..."

Miller: "But to expand, or to build, or to change the school, it's gonna cost money. So... so I guess... what I'm hearing is so... do we know... do we have a projected amount on... on what it's gonna cost to create these charter schools?"

Turner, A.: "No, I don't. I'm just..."

Miller: "Representative, do we have... do we have a... we do not have a cost esti... do you have a cost estimate on what the past charter schools have..."

Turner, A.: "Representative, it varies from school to school. It depends on where that school is located. It depends, you know, in a case where the school took over an existing school building, they may have to do as very little build out. If they're taking over an old commercial building somewhere, they may have to do more. It really varies and it's based upon that individual school."

Miller: "Is there some type of range?"

Turner, A.: "I have no idea, Representative."

Miller: "Okay."

Turner, A.: "And in fact, all I'm asking is that we increase the number of schools. In terms of the funding and how they're

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

created, that's for the board to make the determination. Now, I give to you... I grant you, there was another Bill that dealt with the funding question and I believe that's what the previous speaker spoke of in terms of the negotiations and the meetings that went on. I'm not privy to that negotiations. I know that there was a breakdown. That negotiation would have requested that there was some funds be made available, some in terms of loans and/or grants. That Bill is not before us right now and all we're asking for at this time... because the schools that are online, there are three schools waiting for two slots and I believe, that they have figured, for the most part, how they're going to be able to open this coming September."

Miller: "What's the number of children currently enrolled in charter schools? Do you have any demographics involved in that?"

Turner, A.: "Let me just look in my book here, Representative.

There's 17 charter schools statewide serving about 6,500 kids."

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

Turner, A.: "There are 17 charter schools in existence statewide and they serve currently about 6,500 kids."

Miller: "Okay. Dispersed throughout the State of Illinois."

Turner, A.: "Throughout the state."

Miller: "Okay. Do you have any demographics involved with the number... with the..."

Turner, A.: "Well, we have 13 of the 17... well, there's 13 in Chicago. There's 15... the ability to have 15 in central Illinois and 15 downstate."

Miller: "Okay."

Turner, A.: "I assume that you probably have an interest in the City of Chicago and what those demographics are. Let me go

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

through the charters that are... oh, this is statewide, 71% of the students enrolled in charter schools are African American, 25% of the students enrolled in charter school are Hispanic persuasion and the rest is others."

Miller: "Okay. Do you know of any charter schools that have closed and the reasons why?"

Turner, A.: "There was one charter school that closed, think there was a problem with... There was one in the Peoria area that closed, I believe, and then there was one in the Chicagoland area that closed, and it had something to do with the board and what they were doing. I mean, let me just say this, Representative, and I think I said it earlier, this is not a perfect situation. There's no one that said that 100% of the charter schools was the answer. In fact, if charter schools was the answer, then the board would adopt it and we'd move forward with charter schools We're just looking at this as another alternative only. and there has been some failures. Two out of 17, I don't believe is a real bad number considering that if you look at the enrollment and the size of those schools, it was not a lot of students affected by it. And the schools... The kids from the charter school in the City of Chicago that failed were put back in other schools. And in fact, let me describe that charter school that failed. It was one, think, that dealt with children who were substance abusers, who had other kinds of problems, that the normal school does not deal with, and this particular charter school thought they would be able to address it, but the problems in terms of substance abuse, penal and other correction problems that these kids were confronted with, the school was not able to address."

Miller: "One last question, before I address the Bill. You...

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

you mentioned that the school had closed. Do you know whether it's because of academic scores, or whether it's because of lack of funding?"

Turner, A.: "It was not academic scores. It had more so to do with the social problems that these students had in terms attendance, other problems that the kids had that was above and beyond the academic problem. All we're trying to do with charter schools is just provide an alternative to give kids another chance... those who have given up on the system... Not necessarily given up on the system, the very fact that they decide to go to a charter school says that they have not given up on education, but trying a different approach to educate those kids. One of the advantages are... is certainly smaller class sizes. would be the first to stand on this floor and say, support smaller class sizes for the public school system in its entirety, and maybe the public school system, when they throughly look at charter schools and what they're doing, will be able to say, well, this is one of many elements that will make a difference in trying to educate our kids."

Miller: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Miller: "I rise in strong opposition to this legislation for various reasons, for primarily what the two Sponsors have indicated. First off, there's been no clear mechanism on the funding issue of charter schools that I've heard of yet. And so it's hard to expand something without some kind of clear revenue stream or where clear moneys are gonna come from for these schools to attend (sic-expand). Second thing that we've been criticized in... some of the Black Caucus Members have been criticized for being against charter schools based on the fact that it helps minorities.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

My district is made of 80% African American, however, the charter school in my district composed of 45% Hispanic and 65% African American. So, there's some issues of probably who are they letting in and how's that message of charter schools existing. But, ultimately, I think and believe, it comes down to funding. I wasn't privileged to the school district 65 and 202 in Evanston, Illinois, so who wouldn't be for smaller class size, good teachers, and so on and so forth. However, my kids in my 29th Representative District don't have that opportunity. Since the beginning of this legislative Session, I've been fighting for paint for my schools, paint. The halls have not been painted. They are chipping. Paint's coming of the roof. And to this date, it has not been done. So, with limited education dollars, with limited funds, it is very difficult for me to be able to support any mechanism to take dollars away from the children who need it. Simply stated, we can't leave any children behind. And I request the General Assembly to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 78."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

 Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

 Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, do the teachers who teach in charter schools have to have degrees?"
- Turner, A.: "Over 85% of the teachers in charter schools are certified."
- Davis, M.: "No, no, no. We're not talking about certification,

 Representative. Right now, we're talking about

 college-educated people."
- Turner, A.: "Representative, I believe that they all have to have a four-year degree. They may not necessarily have to have

69th Legislative Day

- May 31, 2001
- a teaching certificate, but I do believe that a college degree is the requirement."
- Davis, M.: "Do you... You said that you thought about 85% of the teachers in charters schools were certified people."
- Turner, A.: "That's correct."
- Davis, M.: "Does your Bill mandate that they're certified in..."
- Turner, A.: "No, it doesn't."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. So, the new schools you're recommending does not demand or mandate that we have certified teachers who will teach 71% African American and 25% Hispanic students?"
- Turner, A.: "Representative, I don't know if those schools are gonna be 71% African American or 25% Hispanic, but it does not require certification for those particular teachers.

 No."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, do the board members of charter schools have to have background checks?"
- Turner, A.: "I don't know the answer to that, Representative.

 And let me say that I'm not a proponent of background checks and I voted against background checks for parents on LSCs. I don't think background checks are necessary.

 I'm..."
- Davis, M.: "Well..."
- Turner, A.: " ... one who..."
- Davis, M.: " ... Representative, when..."
- Turner, A.: " ... is opposed to..."
- Davis, M.: "Representative..."
- Turner, A.: " ... people looking at arrest records and going at backgrounds because I don't think that that's an issue."
- Davis, M.: "Well, Representative, some of us who have children, we are very concerned about who's in charge of their lives for the day. Who is leading this system of children? We have to be concerned about that. So, the board members of

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

these charter schools do not have to have background checks. Do the teachers have to have background checks?

Representative?"

- Turner, A.: "I think that all of the teachers of the state have to be... have to have background checks, if I'm not mistaken. I believe legislation that we pass now requires background checks on all teachers. In fact, if you recall, there was a teacher who was fired in the south suburbs because of a marijuana arrest some 15 or 20 years ago, so they do have to have background checks. Board members don't have to have it, in fact, I don't think a background check is required for Chicago school board members."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, do you know why some of these charter schools that you're proposing will be owned by businessmen who are seeking to earn a profit?"
- Turner, A.: "I'm not sure about that one, Representative. I can't answer that question. I didn't know that teaching kids was going to earn you a profit. I didn't realize it was that kind of business."
- Davis, M.: "You're not aware that some profit-making companies want to open charter schools, Representative?"
- Turner, A.: "So, how do they make money, Representative? If, you
 know, I'm a businessman and I open up a school, I don't see
 where educating students is going to make money for me as a
 businessman."
- Davis, M.: "How it makes money, Representative..."
- Turner, A.: "And if you could explain that one to me, I'd
 appreciate it."
- Davis, M.: "I'll explain it by having noncertified people who you pay a small salary, but you collect four thousand and some dollars for each child that sits in the classroom."
- Turner, A.: "Representative, you and I both know that \$4,700...

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- \$4,650 is not enough money to educate kids in this state. Unfortunately, we do that and to say that somebody's going to make money on \$4,600, when every school district in the state is asking for a higher level for their foundation, I think is erroneous and it is not fair to say that someone is going to get rich teaching those students."
- Davis, M.: "So, Representative, you believe, you really believe, that these people who wanna open 13 or 15 more charter schools in Chicago are very concerned about 71% and 25% African-American and Hispanic children."
- Turner, A.: "Let me say this, Representative. I have three in my district, so I do believe. I've got the students. I see these kids go to that school everyday. They decided not to go to Austin. They decided not to go to Marshall. They decided not to go to Manley and they go to the charter school that's four blocks from me. These kids will be graduated from high school, some of which will be going to college next year. Now, is there some ulterior motive to these kids that they don't want to see them go on? I don't know. All I do know is that these kids will have the opportunity to go to college because they're going to a charter school. I thank the good Lord that it's there."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, did you know that preschool teachers have to be certified?"
- Turner, A.: "Representative, I told you before. I don't know what the... in terms of background and I agree that preschool teachers should be looked at in terms of those people who are dealing with very young minds. These charter schools and the teachers that are working at these schools, I think, should be commended, the fact that they're willing to even take on that challenge. Let me just give this one tidbit. That in my particular

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

community, in North Lawndale, that the attendance rate for the kids who went to the charter school is up 16% over the attendance rate for kids who go to regular school. That, in itself, says that something good is going on. I hope that these kids that go to those schools will learn and be able to go on and not necessarily do it in the charter school. I mean, you know, what's the difference between charter school, private school, magnet schools? All I'm saying is that education will make a difference. It's going to make a big difference in our community. When I look at talkin' about standing up and I've been fighting for affordable housing in this state for the 20 years that I've been here, one of the main drawbacks that we have, I can get a young couple to move into my community, I can create a \$200 thousand house, they'll move in tomorrow. But the day that their child is born, decide, I can't live in the City of Chicago. And that's not just my community, that's throughout the entire city. So they leave the City of Chicago and move to the suburbs where they think schools are better. The City of Chicago supports charter schools. They wanna see, does it work, why does it work. The jury is still out. All I can tell you that the preliminary reports on it, they look pretty good. Now, whether there's some millionaires making more money as a result of teaching kids, all I can say is, 'God bless 'em.' Because I know this, if you teach 'em, that's something you can't take away from 'em and it's going to make a big difference for all of us in the state in the long run."

Davis, M.: "Representative, I would like to know, what is the criteria for a student to be enrolled in a charter school?"

Turner, A.: "It's on a lottery basis. Every school student can

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

apply. He certainly needs the permission and the support of his parents to go to that school, unlike magnet schools."

Davis, M.: "Representative, we have a Legislator sitting here who attempted to get some children or a child in her district in a charter school and was refused without any explanation, just, we don't want him."

Turner, A.: "Representative, I have no idea. I don't know what charter school she applied... he or she applied to. I don't know what the enrollment was at that school. I don't know at what point that Representative applied. Many times, because we're here in Springfield, we don't always get home to do things in a timely fashion. It may have been that he or she applied too late. I have no idea about that. All I can tell you... In fact, the very fact that you say that he or she applied and was not admitted says that there's a need for more schools. And that's a Legislator that tried to get their kid in a charter school."

Davis, M.: "Well..."

Turner, A.: "So, that tells me that we need more."

Davis, M.: "Representative, if they don't have any criteria for acceptance, like Chicago's public schools, then they cherry pick. They pick those students, perhaps, who are from two-family homes. They pick those students, perhaps, whose reading scores are high. They pick those students, perhaps, who may not be discipline problems and Chicago public schools opens the doors and said, you all come and we do teach all of them. But let me just ask you a question. Are you aware that your opponents of this legislation are the following: Illinois Education Association..."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... Illinois Federation of Teachers..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... AFL-CIO..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... AFSCME, American Federation of..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... State and Municipal Employees..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... the Illinois Parent-Teacher..."

Turner, A.: "I would hope that they don't hate me..."

Davis, M.: "Representative, I'm talking."

Turner, A.: " ... because of one Bill, Representative."

Davis, M.: "May I speak, please?"

Turner, A.: "No."

Davis, M.: "May I speak?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Turner, please be polite."

Davis, M.: "Included with that list, Representative, are the Illinois PTA..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... the Parent-Teachers Association..."

Turner, A.: "My friends."

Davis, M.: " ... the School District Association."

Turner, A.: "I love them, too."

Davis, M.: "Now, that's a large group, that's a large group of people who support education, who support children and who support teachers. And I am totally appalled that you are not aware of that opposition."

Turner, A.: "Representative, let me tell you who the proponents are."

Davis, M.: "Don't."

Turner, A.: "The Chicago Public Schools, LUDA, SBE, IMA,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Metropolitan Planning Council, Civic Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Business Round Table, Chicagoland Chamber, Leadership for Quality Education, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Jones, Arthur Turner..."

Davis, M.: "I hope they get you reelected."

Turner, A.: " ... and a few more that live in my community."

Davis, M.: "I hope they get you reelected. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "According to the Constitution of the State of Illinois, we are to have one school district and it specifically states that you are to have one school district under one State Board of Education. You are not to have a number of different school districts who don't operate under the confines of the laws of the State of Illinois. It really amazes me when we pass legislation in this Body making some schools have local governance, local governance electing 11 people with the principal on this commission or committee who make the rules for the school and select the principal. And then this same group of people who passed this legislation now say, your children, if they don't want to, don't have to go and be a part of the system we created. Now, we're gonna create for your children a new system, a system called charter schools where the teachers don't have to be certified because these children are not that important. You should be ashamed to say that some boys and girls don't deserve a certified teacher. Now, what's the difference in certified and noncertified? A certified teacher makes sure the boys and girls are safe. A certified teacher makes certain that children are given homework and that it's graded. certified teacher has been through rigorous training and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

these people who are purporting to have noncertified people teach some children are even asking that we be recertified. There is legislation for recertification that has passed this Body, that people have to go back to school and improve what they already know. But to satisfy the mandates of the state, we, as they, do that. But now, come up with a piece of legislation that says for 71% of African-American children and 25% of Hispanic children which adds up to 96% of group of children in the City of Chicago don't deserve that. I personally feel that if this legislation had been so good we'd have more charter schools than just those operating in Chicago. Representative Giles (sic-Turner) alluded to or talked about the status of charter schools across this country. Many of them are closing because they're not doing as well as the public In Chicago, Acorn School does not have one schools. certified teacher, not one. Saint James School, Chicago, closes in the middle of the semester. Oh, it may be funny because they're not your children, but it is not funny at all. Saint James children, where are they gonna go to school when Saint James closes? In the middle semester, they gotta find a public school to put them in. This is more than a lark. It is more than a lark, it is a business deal. It's a business deal by people who want to use our children to earn money. You said, how can you earn money on four thousand and some dollars per child, paying the teacher less than a certified teacher earns. And when you remove these children, you are depleting the resources for the majority of our children. Now, I'm for educating all children, not just mine or not just a select I'm for educating all the children in the State of few. Illinois. Now, anybody who doesn't have a charter school,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

how can you support one for my district, if you don't have one and refuse to have one? Some Legislators in this Body are in court today, listen carefully Ladies and Gentlemen, they're in court, their district is in court saying, we don't want a charter school in this district. How can you support something that makes my children have an educational system that is regressive, but then again these are 71% African American and 25% Hispanic. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. 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 Turner to close."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Let me, first of all, I won't say apologize to the Lady, but also say that I do respect Representative Davis. She has been an educator and involved in education much longer than I have and so I am not going to, in any way, want to say that she does not know what she's talking about on this particular issue, but that we disagree and we have that right to disagree. I also want her to know that did give some numbers in terms of the number of African-American students that are involved in charter schools, but I can name one charter school in the City of Chicago and there are others that I mentioned. where 81% of the students at that school are white. And when we talk about this issue of certification, the thing that I think that teachers at the charter school bring that sometimes certification does not necessarily bring and I'm

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

not to denounce those who have certification, is they have a desire and they have a willingness to be there. If they wanna work for less money and they're there, that's that teacher's prerogative. And if you wanna question the issue of certification, I don't think any university professor in this state has to be certified. In fact, you can be taught by grad students and anyone else at a university. certification alone should not be the variable in determining in whether a child learns. I want you also to realize that again this Bill is not about money, it's about an opportunity and I just feel that this is the right thing to do to allow the opportunity for additional charter schools to be created. There is no fund... There's not 15 schools... or 15 people waiting to open schools, currently. We have three that are ready to go and I'm just asking for the opportunity to increase the number of charters in the City of Chicago. And I move for the favorable adoption of Senate Bill 78."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Davis, you spoke in the debate.

Why do you seek recognition? Your verification request

will be granted. The question is, 'Shall the House pass

Senate Bill 78?' All those in favor will signify by voting

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record.

On this question, there are 36 Members voting 'yes', 77

Members voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. And this

Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority,

is hereby declared lost. Representative Persico for a

Motion."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend the Rules to posting requirements for Senate Bill 694."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there leave? Leave is granted to suspend the posting requirements. The Clerk has an announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "The following committees will meet immediately: the Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education Committee in Room 118, the Appropriations-General Services Committee in Room 114, the Environment & Energy Committee in Room D-1, the Higher Education Committee in Room C-1 and the Public Utilities Committee in Room 122-B."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Schoenberg, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suspend the posting requirements for the following Bills so they could be heard in subject matter hearings in the Appropriations Committee for General Services: House Bill 2125, Senate Amendment #2; House Bill 3440, Senate Amendment #1; House Bill 3489, Senate Amendment #2; House Bill 3491, Senate Amendment #1; and House Bill 3493, Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Chair recognizes Representative Curry."
- Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to make a Motion to suspend the posting requirements for House Bill 3050, Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "I just wanted a question for Representative Schoenberg before you gave him leave."

Speaker Hartke: "I'm sorry."

Parke: "Are these all the budget Bills? Is there anything other than budget Bills in those that you listed?"

Schoenberg: "They are budget, budget implementation, and bond-related Bills."

Parke: "Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative..."

69th Legislative Day

- May 31, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: " ... a Motion on the floor suspending the posting requirements by Representative Curry. Does she have leave? Leave is granted. The Chair recognizes Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to concur with the Lady's Motion. House Bill 3050 is for budget implementation purposes and part of the agreement. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The House is not in recess, yet. Rules Report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' House Amendment #1 to House Resolution 350 and a Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 479."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie for a Motion. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that House Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 10 can be heard in the Committee on Revenue."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there leave to suspend the posting requirement for Senate Bill 10, Amendment #4? Leave is granted. The House stands in recess 'til the hour of 7:45 p.m."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2900?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2900 is on the Order of Concurrence. A Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 3 and 4 has been

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Is Representative Hamos in the chamber?

Representative Hamos on the Motion to Concur in Senate

Amendment #3 and 4 to House Bill 2900. Representative

Hamos. Representative Hamos. We're all waiting with bated

breath for you, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. We may have to filibuster this, Mr. Speaker, until people get back."

Speaker Madigan: "No, we'll be fine, they're coming."

Hamos: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "They hear your eloquent tone, they're coming."

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm pleased to Hamos: "Okay. present the... I'm sorry. I'm pleased to present what has really been the culmination of 18 months of work by the bipartisan, bicameral telecommunications rewrite process. Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, 16 years ago a Legislator in Illinois by the name of Dennis Hastert stood here and said that we were entering a new era in telecom... a new era in telecom, 16 years ago. He said at that time that the monopoly was ending and that it was fact, implement new policies to telecommunications. The goal then was the same as it is which is to have universally available and today, affordable high-quality service for Illinois residents in The technology has changed, but the telecommunications. goals have not. Seven years later in 1992, that goal was reaffirmed in the first sunset of the Telecommunications Act. And today, we are doing the second sunset of the Telecommunications Act. But we are still in transition, as you know, because we have not really ended the monopoly and we are very much in a transition stage. And this Bill ought to be considered as a transition Bill that will move

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

us into the next era. And that's why it actually has a four-year sunset, a very quick sunset, because the tele... technology is changing and so is the world of telecommunications. This Bill represents a balanced And, you know, we have a lot of company approach. lobbyists that we have been talking to all these many months, but it's really our constituents and our consumers back home who will most benefit from this Bill, both residential and business consumers. And I'm pleased to tell you that this is being hailed by CUB as one of the most consumer-friendly, if not the most consumer-friendly Bill in the entire nation. And I'd like to tell you why this Bill is supported by CUB and AARP and as well as the business side by IMA and IRMA. We think that this Bill is good for consumers in several different ways. Number one, service quality standards will be required for all carriers statewide on installation and repairs and there will be certain time frames. And there will be strict penalties for the failures to comply. And you can go home and rest assured when you tell your consumers back home that the many problems that they have experienced will now have some very direct remedies attached to them; automatic credits on their phone bills for even missed appointments, the kind of thing that really irritates our constituents. Number two, there are new flat-rate service packages for residential consumers. So, there will have to be offered a budget package, a flat-rate package, and an flat-rate package. Number three, in this very exciting world of computers and high-speed Internet, we are going to require that there be deployment of high-speed Internet to 80% of the market. And this high-speed... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This high-speed Internet to 80% of the market,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

with some waivers attached, will be supported, in part, by a new Digital Divide Fund. And actually, two funds that we will be creating. One for infrastructure to help deploy high-speed Internet into areas... rural areas of the state where it's not economically easy to provide high-speed Internet. And we're also going to provide for a new eliminate the digital divide in more urban areas. we're also pleased to report that we have found three kinds of funding sources for that Digital Divide Fund and these will be funding sources that will be sustainable and will be continued as we move forward. It begins with a million amount that will be divided into two funds, \$30 million that we were able to find through an existing docket case and will be allocated to those two funds. Fourth, there will be new protections for what's called slamming, cramming, and jamming. And these are, again, the practices that we've heard about from our constituents where the long-distance carrier is switched or not switched against their wishes. Number five, there will be a new enhanced enrollment in the Lifeline Program. And this is the program primarily funded by the Federal Government that helps low-income consumers with their telephone bills. Number six, there will be a streamlined consumer complaint process making it easier for consumers who do complaints to go to the ICC. And then, that will also include voluntary mediation. Number seven, we will enhance the ICC enforcement powers when there are violations of the Act. And what we have done here on a federal level... Mr. Speaker, can you try to get the volume down a little bit? Thank you. On the federal level, they are reporting that, in fact, the fines and penalties have not gone far enough. They are looking to expand eightfold, the kind of fines

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

that will be available on the federal level. That's what we're trying to emulate here in Illinois. So, we have created a new set of fines and penalties that will be about eightfold from where we are today for the most major penalty. And again, it's up to that amount based percent of gross revenues so that we can be fair. are some carriers that are smaller than other carriers. And there will be different grades of how much penalty will be applied to different carriers. And number eight... And finally number eight, let me say that the most important part of this Bill in some ways to help our consumers back home is that this Bill will, hopefully, finally enter... move us into the age of competition. And I'd like to just tell you why competition is so important constituents back home. In the one state that now really has some experience with competition, New York, report to you that jobs have increased by four percent at the phone company. And that's why we actually think that this Bill will also be good for labor, for the IBEW friends that we have who work for Ameritech. The rates in New York, in one year, have decreased by 15%. That's because of competition. There are now carriers that are competing and lowering their rates to attract business. infrastructure investment in New York has increased by 23%. And there are one million consumers in one year who have already exercised their consumer choice. So, with that, let me end by saying that this is a far-reaching Bill, it's important Bill. I'm open to your questions and I hope you will give this your consideration and be proud when you take this home to sell it to your consumers."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos has moved for the passage of the Bill. There are eight people seeking recognition.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

The Chair would suggest that we hear from three proponents and three people in response and then go to Roll Call. And the Chair will recognize Mr. Black in response."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I hope you have a good long-distance carrier, because the opening of your Bill, if you don't, you've incurred some serious toll charges. But be that as it may, let me ask you a couple of questions that I can't find in this Bill. Is there anything in this Bill anywhere that you can direct me that says, local competition is mandated, that by the end of this period of time in four years, I will be able to go to somebody and say, what can you do for me on my local service?"

Hamos: "Well, Mr. Representative Black, I guess I'd have to say that local competition is a function of market forces."

Black: "Oh."

Hamos: "And the market will take this into different parts of the state at different rates. And that's especially because we are in a transition period and will be in a transition period for the short-term in Illinois."

Black: "So, in other words, there isn't anything in here, for all of the talk I've heard, for all of the months about local competition, there isn't one thing in this Bill that says at the end of four years, I'm going to be able to go to a variety of suppliers in my small town and say, hello, I would like better rates. Which one of you is going to be my local service provider? There's nothing in this Bill whatsoever that says I'm gonna have anybody to choose from on local service, is there?"

Hamos: "Representative Black, I can't guarantee that for you.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

But what this Bill offers is the possibility that, in fact, the market will open. The problem here has been that because we have two major companies, incumbents, who own the infrastructure, it has been very difficult for newcomers, for the competitors to come into Illinois and to be able to access that infrastructure in order to provide services to us. This Bill, especially one very important part of this Bill called Section 801, in fact, will open the market in Illinois. It will happen in different ways at different times, but that is, in fact, the promise of this Bill."

Black: "You and I are in complete agreement on that. Is there anything in this Bill that regulates a portability charge? You know, I'm supposed to be able to take my phone number wherever I go. If I move to Aurora, or Naperville, although Representative Cowlishaw said she wouldn't let me move there, I'm supposed to be able to take my number with me. And there is an authorized fee for that service. Do I have portability in my district? Do you have portability in yours?"

Hamos: "Representative Black, I'm told that number of portability is already authorized by the Federal Commerce Commission and is incorporated in orders of the Illinois Congress Commission."

Black: "Yes, and what do we pay for that portability that's authorized?"

Hamos: "I don't use that service, I don't know."

Black: "Oh. You check your Bill, it's on there. Anywhere from 46 cents a month to a dollar a month. And you know what's amazing about that? I don't have portability in my district, but it's on my Bill. I would recommend that you read a March 6, 2000 article from the Wall Street Journal,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

The Fees That Ate My Phone Bill. You ought to read the fees that are on here. In all due respect to the lawyers in Illinois and Chicago, it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret my monthly phone bill. Is there anything in this Bill that says, if my local supplier, who is, I think, currently Ameritech, would happen to go bankrupt, who takes over my service?"

Hamos: "We don't think there's any plausible possibility that Ameritech will go bankrupt."

Black: "There were people in California that never ever thought they would turn on the switch and would have no electricity. The question is, is there any guarantee in this Bill that if my local provider goes bankrupt, who then furnishes me telephone service?"

Hamos: "The ICC will protect all parts of this state through the carrier of last resort. That is not a possibility right now, but there is an infrastructure in Illinois. And we do think that if that should happen, that somebody else would step in to take over that infrastructure. There is telephone service, not only in all parts of Illinois, but in all parts of the nation. So, that is not... I don't know that this Bill is the one that covers that situation."

Black: "What does this Bill do on the current practice, particularly onerous practice on senior citizens, prevalent throughout my legislative district, I assume yours, and that is called measured service? You get charged so much a call and so much per minute. Whether it's a local call or a long-distance call, it doesn't make any difference, it's called measured service. And I have senior citizens who have retired and they volunteer for the Cancer Society or the Heart Fund and they make dozens and dozens of calls. And the more calls they make, the higher their bill,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

because they're charged a fee for each call. Is that practice stopped under this Bill by the time this Bill sunsets in four years?"

Hamos: "Again, I think, Representative Black, I'd like to answer your question this way. The Bill itself will provide for three kinds of flat-rate packages that have to be offered. They don't have to be offered currently. One of those packages is the budget package. And that might, in fact, be very attractive to seniors who don't need to use the phone as much as others of us. And that... And then keep in mind that that's one of the things that we asked AARP to look at with us. AARP is supporting this Bill. We looked at other issues that will help seniors, the service quality issues and to make sure that there's adequate information being provided to consumers about what their rights are under the Service Quality Section. That was put into the Bill at the request of AARP. And we're glad to continue working with AARP to also make sure that, in fact, the Lifeline Program is made more available, not only through the enhanced enrollment we're already providing for in the But just in the past couple of days, we've thought some other opportunities, for example, at housing, where applications could be made available so that low-income seniors could apply very easily to the Lifeline Program. So, we have, in fact, looked out for seniors. Ultimately, what we would like to be able to do is to promote competition so that different companies will able to offer different packages and people will have a right to select among them based on their own income and their own needs."

Black: "That's all well and good, Representative. I had a lady talk to me Memorial Day at a ceremony at the National

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Cemetery in Danville, delightful lady, lifelong Democrat, by the way. She only asked me one question. She said, 'Does this Bill eliminate the nickel I have to pay for every call I make?' And she's the volunteer who makes dozens and dozens of calls for charitable organizations. And all Mrs. Baumgardt wants to know, does this Bill eliminate that practice of measured service in rural Illinois?"

Hamos: "Representative Black, you will be able to go home and tell that woman that, in fact, Ameritech has to offer a flat-rate package which could be a budget package if that's her need. And that will, in fact, eliminate the five cents a phone call."

Black: "And I will so inform her. Thank you, Representative. I... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I've been around long enough to know... I was born at night, but not last night. I'm tired of being Don Quixote and I'm tired of getting run over by trains. And this train's on the track. But as I said in committee, and I won't belabor the point, those of you who live in the high-growth, high-density population will, I think, see some benefit from this Bill far more quickly than those of us in rural Illinois. And at some point, I wish one of you could get up and just make me one simple promise that the digital divide, while the Sponsor has given an honest answer, is not just those who can afford a computer and Internet access and those who can't. In my area, it's that you may have to go through three or four levels of toll charges before you can get on the That, to me, is the digital divide, more so than system. the issue of finances. The... Most of the towns in my district are made up of very small communities, 3,000 or less. Generally, they were served by GTE, which is now

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Verizon sits on the sideline in this Bill, for Verizon. the most part. They have some service contracts that they must meet and they're supposed to make certain things available, like high-speed Internet access. And I know that they're gonna break their back to make sure that Alvin, Illinois, a town of 250 people, gets DSL by August I'm just really comfortable and confident of that. Those of us in rural Illinois will not see the benefits as quickly as some of the rest of you will. I hope everything you said about this Bill, Representative, comes true. I really do. And if it does, I'll be the first to stand here... No, I'm not gonna be here in four years. But I'll write you a note and I'll congratulate you and apologize for ever doubting that this was a good Bill. But there are a number of issues not addressed in this Bill, not among the least of which is nobody has ever called my home and begged me to change my local service to their company. Nobody wants local service in my district. if it wasn't for the underlying Universal Telephone Law in Federal Law, they'd dump most of the towns in my district tomorrow morning. There's no money in it. I'll leave you with this thought, Representative. I've been dealing with this subject for about 14 years, back when... before Judge Green... or right after Judge Green broke up Ma Bell. Deregulation was the answer. Deregulation was gonna give us competition. Deregulation was gonna bring us into the 21st century. What has it done? Deregulation has changed what used to be a \$10 a month phone bill to a \$25 a month phone bill. And about the only thing I can see that it did, it let me buy a Mickey Mouse phone without having to get permission of the Federal Communications communication (sic-Commission). Don't oversell this Bill. Don't try to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

tell me it's the latest model with all the bells and whistles 'cause it isn't gonna be that way all throughout the State of Illinois. I hope this works. I hope it does what those of you who have worked so hard on it say it will do, but I have serious reservations as to whether this Bill will deliver all that you think it will to all of the people of Illinois at the same time. I'll... I don't know how I'm gonna vote on this thing. I know a train on the track when I see it and I'm getting tired of being run over by it. But I'll tell you this, if I write you a note and congratulate you in four years for what you've done, you agree to write me a note and apologize if what you say happen, in fact, doesn't happen."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, again, Representative Hamos has spoken in support of the Bill. Representative Black has stood in response. There shall be two more in support and two more in response, and then there will be Representatives Persico and Moore for the purpose of legislative intent and we will go to Roll Call. For those who are in support of the Bill, the following people are seeking recognition: Representative Steve Davis, Michael Bost, Connie Howard, Shirley Jones, Kay Wojcik. Are any of you wishing to stand in support? Mr. Bost, in support."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do stand in support of the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Hopefully, we can clear up some of the concerns that were directed by the last speaker. You and I have worked together, along with many others, over the last 18 months, two years, whatever it's been. I think there were some things spoken about... And maybe the last speaker's right in some concern. Will it provide equal access and equal

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

competition across the state? Probably not. But let's look at what we have provided. Can you ex... First off, there were certain issues that we chose not to deal with. Can you explain what those were and why we chose not to deal with them?"

Hamos: "We chose... Representative Bost, we chose not to deal with wireless service, because that is, in fact, regulated by the Federal Government. We chose not to deal with cable. And that's regulated by the Federal Government, although, cable is included in this Bill if, in fact, the technology evolves, and it's beginning to, where the cable company also provides telephone service."

Bost: "Is it not also true, though, that we chose not to deal with wireless because it has competition right now?"

Hamos: "It does."

Bost: "And it is competition that is growing very quickly to a majority of the state."

Hamos: "That's right."

Bost: "And we didn't want to slow that down."

Hamos: "That's right."

Bost: "All right. With this, another mention... something else was mentioned that the only person that has to... or only group that has to work on dealing with a majority of this Bill is Ameritech. And that's not true. What Section of the Bill deals with Ameritech? And what of the whole Bill deals with all others, including Verizon and the small company?"

Hamos: "The most important... I think one of the most important components of this Bill that applies to every carrier, not just Ameritech and Verizon, but the many other new carriers who are coming into the marketplace, is a requirement that certain service quality standards be met. And that means

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

certain time frames for providing installation and repair and certain penalties if, in fact, it doesn't happen in the way that the ICC and the Bill provides. So, service quality is actually a right under this Bill for both residential and business customers. There are some Sections of the Bill, for example, the Section 801 that I had referred to, which is really the market opening portion of this Bill, which right now is applying to Ameritech only, but our hope will be that with a short sunset that four years from now there will, in fact, be competition statewide. And I believe that those sections will be open statewide, as well."

Bost: "Just to expand on your answer, I think that with 801, any other carrier, if they would ever get to the point for Alt Reg, they would then qualify, as well, regardless of what carrier that would be. It's not specific to Ameritech, it's based on the situation that exists at this time."

Hamos: "That is correct."

Bost: "And we did that so as to not slow down the development in the rural areas."

Hamos: "That's right."

Bost: "Would you agree with that?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Bost: "So, what we've done is we've tried to provide service quality for our rural areas, not to slow down growth in any way, but yet, still have these rules and regulations in effect. And another thing that has been mentioned, we also put a sunset only four year out, so that we can deal with this in four years and allow... If things aren't working, we can come back and try to straighten those problems out, is that correct?"

Hamos: "That is correct. And in addition to that, for our

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

downstate Legislators here, let's not underestimate how it is that we will be deploying advanced important services, such as high-speed Internet, and we will be deploying that statewide. Now, we do require both of the incumbents to do that in 80% of the markets, although, especially, initially, if there is а waiver economically not feasible to do that. But then we provide for the Digital Divide Infrastructure Fund that will kick in because we do think that constituents statewide should have access to high-speed Internet as we move into this next stage of the future."

Bost: "Now, Representative, you brought up digital divide. And you mentioned a while ago that there was 30 million that was going to be available for the digital divide. Can you explain how that's broke down and where this money would be used and what it would be used for?"

Hamos: "Yes. There is actually three sources of funding for the digital divide component of this Bill. The initial component is 30 million, which I will explain in a moment. Secondly, 40% of all new fines issued by the ICC will into these two funds, the Digital Divide Funds. finally, both customers as well as employees of telecommunications carriers will be asked voluntarily to pay into these two funds. We have set up these two funds, one of which is primarily for the rural areas to provide for infrastructure for high-speed Internet. And secondly, primarily for urban areas to help with parks, schools, and public hospitals, and libraries to be able to provide technology to those centers of technology. Now, the 30 million is not GRF money in any way. It is the result of what is essentially a settlement that we are providing for in this Bill, an existing business case pending before the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

ICC that has potentially exposure of 200 million or more. In this Bill, we agreed that \$90 million would be refunded to business customers and \$30 million would start up these two very important Digital Divide Funds. The business community has agreed to that and are... In fact, I reported to you, both IMA and IRMA are supporters of this Bill."

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is a Bill that Bost: many of us have worked very long and hard on to try to deal with many issues. We've sat through hours of arguments between CLECs, ILECs, from all parties, CUB, the Commerce Commission. This is not a Bill that was set up for the Chicago area. It is a Bill that has been set up with the concerns of all the state in mind. Now, is it... earlier, might it be easier for mentioned competition to open up in a more urban area? Yes, because the infrastructure that is in place. However, by the way this Bill has been drafted, what we've tried to do is to make sure that we're not slowing down that construction and those lines being put in the rest of the state, so that competition will open up, competition will be provided, not only to the point that we're also talking about when we talk about the digital divide. The 15 million that is being directed downstate... or to be directed into rural is specifically dealing with what the opponent of this Bill spoke against and that is laying in place those lines that will allow us fast access to the Internet, high-speed access, so that our children and we can have the same benefits as the rest of the state. We don't have that right now. Hopefully, this will encourage that to come about. Service quality is something that we're trying to provide statewide in this Bill. I commend the Sponsor.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

commend everyone that has worked on this Bill. And I encourage my downstate colleagues that are from rural areas that... Is this a perfect Bill? No. Are there people that are opposed to this Bill and have been opposed? Yes. When you deal with a Bill of this size, I've not seen one that goes through this chamber when we deal with this many items that there hasn't been questions and certain concerns from business groups, from special interest groups. But the reality is, this Bill is the best that we can do right now. It is like any other Bill, we can come back in the future and adjust it. I'd support your 'aye' vote and encourage your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "We now have had... two people have spoken in support of the Bill and there will be one more in support.

 And the Chair recog... plans to recognize Representative Steve Davis in support. There'll be two more in response.

 Those seeking recognition, who are probably in response, would be Representative Shirley Jones, Representative Connie Howard, Representative Kay Wojcik. In response, the Chair recognizes Representative Shirley Jones."
- Jones, S.: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

- Jones, S.: "Representative, could you tell me how many cages that

 Ameritech have that they let other companies use?"
- Hamos: "How many... I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said, Representative Jones."
- Jones, S.: "With Ameritech, how many cages that they let other companies use? And then, could you name the cages that they let other companies use? Like the CLEC lines. What companies use Ameritech on their lines?"
- Hamos: "Yeah, Representative Jones... Representative Jones, I think what you're referring to is because I had a visit to

- 69th Legislative Day

 one of the switching stations..."

 May 31, 2001
- Jones, S.: "Right. And they..."
- Hamos: " ... that there are co-location agreements so that competitors can come into those areas and can set up their own operations so that they can hook into Ameritech's infrastructure. And I'm sure that..."
- Jones, S.: "And could you tell me the name of the companies that's using they equipment?"
- Hamos: "Representative Jones, there are... we are at the very beginning stages of having competitors come to Illinois.

 We met with many of them..."
- Jones, S.: "I didn't ask you that."
- Hamos: " ... over the last 18 months."
- Jones, S.: "I asked you, who are using Ameritech's equipment?"
- Hamos: "Well, there are..."
- Jones, S.: "I would like the answer of who's using Ameritech equipment. Is it AT&T? Is it Sprint? Is it MCI? Who's using the equipment?"
- Hamos: "There are groups of competitors. And I'm sure that $\text{AT\&T...} \\ \text{$^{\text{AT\&T...}}$}$
- Jones, S.: "But could you tell me, is AT&T using their equipment?"
- Hamos: "Well, we think that, in fact..."
- Jones, S.: "I'm asking you, yes or no, is AT&T using their equipment?"
- Hamos: "I think so. And they're paying for that service."
- Jones, S.: "Do you know if A... You say, you think so. You think so? Okay. Could you tell me if MCI is using their equipment?"
- Hamos: "I think so. And they're paying for that service."
- Jones, S.: "And... Right. And could you tell me if Sprint using their equipment?"

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Hamos: "I think so. And they're paying for it, as well."

Jones, S.: "Well, I could tell you they are using that equipment.

Okay. They have other companies that's using that equipment. Now, you're talking about De Reg now. Could you tell me who's doing long distance in the State of Illinois?"

Hamos: "Who provides long distance?"

Jones, S.: "Yes."

Hamos: "AT&T, MCI, Sprint, maybe others."

Jones, S.: "Oh, you know that. Now, could you tell me, can Ameritech do long distance in the State of Illinois?"

Hamos: "Not yet. We'd like them to."

Jones, S.: "Why they wasn't added onto this Bill, then? If we want De Reg, why wasn't they added on into this Bill?"

Hamos: "Representative Jones, that is actually an application process that is approved by the Federal Government."

Jones, S.: "Did AT&T and MCI have to have an application to use Ameritech equipment?"

Hamos: "The fed... We have a Federal Law on the books since 19..."

Jones, S.: " ... "

Hamos: "Representative Jones, I'm trying to answer your question."

Jones, S.: "Okay."

Hamos: "Since 1996, there has been a Federal Law that requires incumbent carriers like Ameritech to open their networks to competitors. And still, Ameritech has 90% of the market, but the competition is beginning. One of these days, Ameritech will, in fact, apply, they haven't yet, to become a long-distance carrier in Illinois. When there is enough competition in Illinois, that will happen. We hope it'll happen because we'd like to see as much competition at

- 69th Legislative Day

 every level of the telecommunications industry as possible.

 That helps our consumers."
- Jones, S.: "And could you tell me why Ameritech is the only one have to be a regulated and how come the long distant (sic-distance) companies are not?"
- Hamos: "Actually, I think they're all regulated by the Federal Law, FCC."
- Jones, S.: "No. You're wrong. I'm talking about here in the State of Illinois, not the federal, the State of Illinois."
- Hamos: "Long distance is actually a federal issue and it's regulated by the Federal Commerce Commission."
- Jones, S.: "Now, getting back to digital divide, why was digital divide... When I was in the meetings, we were told that we was gonna have digital divide, me and Representative (sic-Senator) Shaw asked for \$40 million. That \$40 million was going to everybody in the State of Illinois for their city colleges. Could you tell me why this is going to ICC and not to some of the city colleges?"
- Hamos: "Well, I think... Ladies and Gentlemen and Representative

 Jones, you know, I think that one day there was a proposal..."
- Jones, S.: "How do the people apply to get this money if they want... If city college wants some money, how would they apply to get the money for the digital divide?"
- Hamos: "Representative Jones, I think that we are setting up a program from scratch. There's going to be an advisory committee. Some of our Members are going to be on the advisory committee. DCCA and ICC will administer that program. Some of the money will go directly to the carriers so that they can provide the wiring to make high-speed Internet..."
- Jones, S.: "You say some..."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Hamos: " ... possible. City colleges..."

Jones, S.: " ... of the money will go to the carriers?"

Hamos: " ... can not do that."

Jones, S.: "Some of the money going to the carriers? Will Ameritech get some of their money back?"

Hamos: "Some of the money in rural areas, I believe, is going to carriers who will actually lay the line to make high-speed Internet possible. I don't think community colleges have the capacity to do that."

Jones, S.: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This Bill is gonna come back to haunt everybody in this room that vote 'yes', because it's not right. And if we gonna go by a Federal Law, we should've waited until Veto Session and then we would have had a federal Bill to go by. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Again, I encourage everybody in here to vote 'present' on this Bill. And we should work more harder on this Bill during Veto Session. We have plenty of time for this Bill to get out of here. We worked on this Bill too fast, and we should have voted... I mean, we should have waited until Veto Session to do this Bill. I urge everybody to vote 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Steve Davis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, S.: "Representative Hamos, it's been a long process. You see me up there. Get me up on that screen, Speaker. She's looking up there for me and all she saw was you. Thank you. Hey, Hartke'd never do that to me if he was in the Chair. Julie, it's been a long process, I've enjoyed the back and forth that we've had. And it's been a complicated Bill and we've spent 18 months on it and everybody on the committee has worked very hard. But I've got a couple of

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

questions, I think, that need to be asked because there are a lot of things in the Bill that wasn't covered in your opening statement. But let's start off by... First, let me say that I'm not quite as euphoric as you are about the fact that this may be the most consumer-friendly Bill in the United States of America. Because currently now, correct me if I'm wrong, but it's my belief that... and I think it's been testified to many times in the committee hearings that we've attended that Ameritech has approximately 98% of the residential... Ameritech currently has about 98% of the residential lines that are serviced in their service area. And by anybody's definition, that's a monopoly and I don't disagree with that. So, correct me if I'm wrong, under Section 801, we are saying that we are opening up this residential market that Ameritech currently has a monopoly on to the competitors, to the CLECs, to open up competition. Is that correct?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Davis, S.: "Also, in Verizon service area, Verizon has testified that, I believe, that 99% of their service area, their local residential lines are owned by Verizon GTE. However, under Section 801, Verizon is exempted out. And can you explain to the Body how exempting Verizon GTE out of 801 will promote competition in their local service area?"

Hamos: "Representative Davis, there's really two reasons that we have elected to keep Verizon out of this Bill. But really, just for the short-term. I do believe that four years from now, we might be in a new space with them. But I do want to say that Verizon is a rate of return regulated utility. They are not... They can not make as much profit. They are accountable to the ICC. They have to come in for any kind of rate increases. They can't just charge what they would

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

like to charge. And second of all, we haven't heard the same level of problems. And really, there's a third reason, too. And that is that the competition is not yet there in downstate rural areas. We hope it will be. And again, that's why we have a very short sunset date on this because the technology is evolving and we hope we'll be able to come back in just a short period and take another fresh look at where we are in this world of competition."

- Davis, S.: "So... But currently, under the current law... and I don't think anybody disputes this, Ameritech, the local residential service and the local business service, currently in Illinois, under 12 business lines are considered being noncompetitive and are under the jurisdiction of the ICC, correct?"
- Hamos: "That is not correct. I believe that was the subject of the case that was before ICC that is now being settled by this Bill. But there was some contention about which business services are currently deemed competitive."
- Davis, S.: "However, local residential is noncompetitive under anybody's definition. And in order for Ameritech or anybody else to go in and get a rate increase, they have to file tariffs with the ICC under current law."
- Hamos: "Ameritech chose to make their residential services noncompetitive. But I would like to point out that really, because we have been negotiating with all the carriers, including Ameritech, what we've agreed to in this Bill is that those vertical services, such as call waiting, caller ID, that those will be... well, actually, those two will not be competitive, but call forwarding and other vertical services will after a two-year period be also called competitive. And what we hope is that we will be able to get those at the reduced rates and there will be

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

competition for some of those vertical services. So, even in the residential markets, in fact, Ameritech will be able to offer those vertical services on a competitive basis after a two-year period."

Davis, S.: "I agree. I'm glad you brought that up because that was going to be one of my questions was about vertical services and the date that they do become competitive under this legislation. As of June 1, 2003, all vertical services other than what, call waiting and caller ID, which are considered to be some form of life safety issues, are going to become competitive June 1, 2003. However, local residential, your line, the line that comes into your home, is still going to be a noncompetitive service and will still be under the jurisdiction of the ICC, is that correct?"

Hamos: "That is true."

Davis, S.: "Okay. Thank you very... That's what I was trying to get at, Julie, really. Thank you, Representative. Okav, so... Let's go back to vertical services for just one second because I think everybody in the chamber should understand this. That in order to try to promote competition, we are going to claim the vertical services as being competitive in June 1st, 2003. However, between now and June 1st, 2003... Really, tell me, what particular part the language in 801 is going to encourage the CLECs, which is the competitive carriers, what is going to encourage them under 801 to come in and get into the local residential market? Now, I'm not talking about business, I'm not talking about four lines or more. I'm talking about four or less and the local residential line into the home. What specific language in 801 is going to encourage these CLECs: AT&T, MCI WorldCom, from coming in to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Ameritech service area and compete, that they're not able to do right now?"

Hamos: "Representative Davis, the most... the Section that we have now referred to several times, Section 801, is really intended to make it accessible for competitors to come into Illinois and to be able to tap into the existing public network. So, just in that one Section, we have provided for many ways that we are now going to codify both federal and local regulations that should make it much more available to competitors to use that network. So, that is one aspect of this. The second thing, it has to do with the way that these competitors do business. What we are told is that when they really look at their service market, their area, they really look at a whole range of services. They would like to be able to offer a full range of services to residential, small business, large business. As long as we've made it difficult for them to do that in Illinois, we haven't yet seen all of that play out. that is, in fact, what we're told is the way that they're moving into other markets such as New York, such as Texas. And as I indicated to you, just in the past year in New York, which has opened up their market to competition, one million residential consumers have exercised their consumer choice to switch from the local telephone company to some competitor. We hope and think that will happen here."

Davis, S.: "I know. And I agree with you what's going on New York, but I think that what's happening also in New York is that the ILECs were able to get into the long-distance market. And that's one of the things that's holding up competition in the State of Illinois, is the ICC has not been very cooperative about the 271 provisions to allow Ameritech into the long-distance markets. And I think that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

that is what has happened in New York and that's why the competition is flourishing in New York. So, you and I have a basic disagreement on the competition part of this, we have, I think, from the beginning. I feel that by keeping rates down, you're not going to have competition, you're not going to have the CLECs rushing to Ameritech's trying to steal their residential customers because the discount in the uniplatform rates are in existence right now for every CLEC to come in and get a discounted rate for Ameritech services for local residential service. Unfortunately, they're not doing that. I don't know what the real answer is to get true competition in the State of And believe me, I wish we had true competition in the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, I don't this Bill is going to promote competition for local residential service it's not going to promote and competition for local businesses. However, the businesses in the State of Illinois are going to make out like a bandit from this Bill. They're going to... they're gonna do very well by this Bill. They're gonna get \$90 million from this Bill. They're gonna have... I'm telling you, businesses with four lines or more... I think you and I agree on this, businesses with fours lines or more, there's gonna be plenty of competition, because that's where the money is in this system. The money in this system is for business lines. That's where the competition is. The money in this system is for vertical services. And that's where the competition is. But unfortunately, I think we're gonna come back here in four years and Ameritech is still going to have 98% of the residential market and Verizon's still gonna have 99%. And that's a basic disagreement that you and I have. However, there are a lot of good things in

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

this Bill. There has been a lot of work on this Bill, there's been a lot of compromise on this Bill. And both you and I have been involved in it and many others, including Senator Sullivan that's standing there. And I would just like to speak to the Bill now. And thank you very much, Representative, it's been an enjoyment. Mr. Speaker, myself, Representative Hamos, Chairman... or cochairman Jones and cochairman Cross and Senator Sullivan, Senator Jacobs in the Senate, Judge Getty, two gentlemen who did all the really legwork and really helped the committee out, Mr. Mike Ward, who negotiated for the CLECs, and Mr. Dave Gebhardt, who did the negotiating for Ameritech, and staff... Senate staff, House staff, Democrat and Republican, did a wonderful job on this Bill. There's been a lot of hours and a lot of in. I'm not as euphoric as Representative Hamos time put is, as I said earlier, about the merits of the Bill, but it's a lot better situation now, I think, than before we went in. I think we missed a couple of opportunities early on in the process. You know, it was funny, as this process was going along, I watched these lobbyists, literally, all day long making thousands of phone calls to their bosses to try to get answers, every single day, thousands of phone calls. You know what, not a single one of them was on a landline. They were all on cellular phones. And unfortunately, wireless and cellular phones are not addressed in this Bill. We also left cable off the table in this Bill. I, personally, I think that that was a mistake. We took it off early. We took both those off early. However, some day maybe the General Assembly can address what's happening in the cable industry with cable telephony, high-speed Internet access with cable,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

high-speed wireless Internet access, wireless telephones. I think that we're going to see in four or five years that there'll be more cellular telephones in the State of Illinois than there are landline phones in the State of Illinois. So, the telecommunications industry is ongoing process. And Ameritech, you know... I'm gonna tell you something, Ameritech's not gonna go broke because of this Bill. Ameritech did pretty good. They could have done better, but they did pretty good. However, here's a couple of things that I'd like to point out that were agreed to. And Ameritech agreed to these things and these are good things that are in the Bill. They agreed to increase penalties from under Section 13-305, they agreed to increase penalties from 2,000 a day to 250,000 a day. That's a 12,500% increase. That's a lot of money. Under 13-516, they agreed to increase penalties from 30,000 a day to 250,000 a day. Under Section 13-517, they agreed to is the 80% high-speed DSL implement Pronto, which deployment, by year 2005. Unfortunately, that other 20% I think's gonna probably come from rural areas and downstate Illinois. And once again, I think that they are going to have a problem accessing the high-speed DSL systems that are going to be available to those in the bigger cities. They agreed to Section 13-518 which sets three flat-rate packages that, once again, the ICC will have to sign off They will have to submit these flat-rate packages to the ICC and the ICC will have to approve those. agreed with Section 13-712 concerning service quality customer credits, which are based on performance as of January 2001, which could end up being a possible 5 to \$10 million in additional penalties. And I'll be honest with you, I think there are a lot of people in this chamber,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

along with myself, who hope that there are no penalties, that there are no fines, that Ameritech and Verizon can their service quality standards because we did increase the service quality standards that they are going And I hope that they meet them. to have to meet. digital divide... Senator Shaw brought up the digital divide early on in the process. And Senator Shaw should get a lot of consideration for doing that. So, we are addressing the digital divide problems in the State of Illinois. It's a good first step. But I would like to say this, I'm going to vote for the Bill. I think that we probably could have done a little better. I think we probably could have done a little more. Unfortunately, think that we ran out of time. Those who put time in on the Bill... Like I said, Senator Sullivan did a yeoman's job chairing the joint subcommittee between the House and the Senate and he deserves a lot of credit for the work The gentlemen that I had mentioned from that he did. Ameritech and from the CLECs spent, literally, thousands of hours in a room. I imagine they're sick of each other. They've probably spent more time with each other than they've spent with their wives over the last ten years. So, I know that they're eager to see this Bill pass out of here so they can get home. But don't go back to your districts and brag about how we really stuck it Ameritech in the General Assembly because I think that would be the wrong thing to do. You know, Ameritech is one of the biggest employers in the State of Illinois. employ 26,000 people and they employ 14,000 IBEW workers. And I might add that Representative Hamos said that this Bill is good for labor. Well, let me tell you something, it's not good for the IBEW 'cause they know their business

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

a heck of a lot more than I do, or Representative Hamos does, or anybody else that is sitting in this chamber. IBEW is opposed to the Bill. But they're not going to hold your feet to the fire if you vote for the Bill because they understand what politics are in the State of Illinois. I tell you, you should probably give this Bill a 'yes' But don't go back in your districts and brag about how you stuck it to Ameritech and how much we're going to charge Ameritech if they don't comply. They're a big employer in the State of Illinois. You know, we created the monster and now we're living with it. We just passed a Bill out here that was going to spend \$40 million to bring 300 workers from Boeing to the State of Illinois, Ameritech has their corporate headquarters in Hoffman Estates that has 3300 employees. So, I don't think that we should be really proud about bashing Ameritech in the General Assembly. So, once again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you very much for the opportunity to stand up and speak on the Bill. I intend to vote 'yes' on the Bill. And I want to thank all of Members on the committee, both sides of the aisle, for spending the last 18 months and working hard to get a Bill that we can pass out of here, 'cause I know I don't want us to go to any more meetings over the summer. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have now debated this Bill for one hour. The Chair plans to Representative Howard and Wojcik to speak to the Bill and then Representative Moore and Persico for the purpose of legislative intent. And then Representative Lang for a disclosure. No more. And I would encourage all future keep their remarks speakers to try and brief.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Representative Howard. We are now into the second hour of debate on this Bill. Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Needless to say, I am ecstatic that this Bill is being brought to us today. House Bill 2900, in my opinion, something that has taken a lot of hard work and has resulted in a product that we all in this state can be I want to commend the Sponsor, Representative proud of. Hamos and the other Members of the Telecommunications Rewrite Committee for all of the work that you have done in the best interests of the consumers. I'm especially pleased that this Bill provides for funds that will be used to help to address the digital divide that exists in inner city and rural communities throughout Incidentally, there are about 56 cities in counties across Illinois that will qualify for funds from those two accounts that will be set up. As we all know, it is essential that the residents of our state have access to computers and the Internet. And as Chairman of the Computer Technology Committee for the House, I'm pleased that this legislation will expand the digital... the Eliminate the Digital Divide Act for which I advocated during the previous legislative year and which recently learned will make it possible for 24 community organizations and thousands of citizens of this state to have access to this technology. I will certainly, gladly support House Bill 2900 and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Wojcik."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Wojcik: "Representative, in Amendment #3 I read that Ameritech is

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

going to have to refund \$90 million to the business customers within 120 days, is that true?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Wojcik: "They also are going to have to give \$15 million to the digital divide, is that true?"

Hamos: "It's 30 million, divided into two funds."

Wojcik: "Well, I have to say something. I have heard that Ameritech has made the statement that they might go bankrupt with this legislation. I also would like to say to you that I represent employees who work for Ameritech in Hoffman Estates. It's one of the largest corporations in my area. I received numerous phone calls today that were very heartwarming and also fearful when I heard what the people had to say. They're livid and they're worried. They're worried because of such of fees like this are going to cause the company to have to cut back on their employees. They're talking about their children, food on the table and here we are again in government, the big brothers, we're gonna deregulate. The green-eyed monsters are out there and we know so much more than everybody else. Well, there's other things to think about instead of the big corporations. We have to think about the people who have jobs with these companies. I watched the deregulation with Ma Bell, it didn't do a darn thing. It raised my phone bill up to almost \$40. The fees are not removed. It's still being charged in this legislation. We aren't doing anything to offset the high cost in our bills and all we're doing now is breaking down another company who's doing a good job. So I say to vote 'no' against this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andrea Moore for the purpose of legislative intent."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you mentioned there are a couple of questions I would like to ask for purposes of legislative intent. And the first one, Represent..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative, are you addressing the questions to Representative Hamos?"

Moore: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Proceed."

Moore: "Representative Hamos, Amendment #4, to the Bill, lines 4 and 5 changes Section 13-801D4, which deals with a competitive carrier's right to purchase what is called the Network Elements Platform. This Amendment identifies that the platform is available for a carrier's use and for its end users or pay-phone service providers. Section 13-801D6 provides for the requirements for the incumbent to provide the platform for existing services. Although D6 makes reference to end users, is it the intent that the provisions of 13-801D6 are equally applicable to providing the platform for use for pay-phone service providers?"

Hamos: "Yes, it is the intent of D6 to identify the requirements for providing the platform on existing telephone lines. This is equally applicable to platforms provided for serving pay-phone service providers as identified in 13-801D4."

Moore: "Thank you. And following that, in Section 13-305 of this Bill, when do the penalties begin to accrue? "

Hamos: "I would like to say for purposes of legislative intent that penalties begin to accrue one day after a carrier receives written notice from the ICC of an alleged violation. It is not our intent, as the General Assembly, that penalties only begin to accrue after the Commission issues an order."

Moore: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, briefly. This

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

has been a Bill that started out to provide competition but got much more complicated than that. I think, like the earlier legislation, this will stand to serve as a model for the entire country. I've been very proud to work on it and I have one very important question for Representative Hamos. There are some Members on our side of the aisle that want to make sure that this telephone will be exempt from the provisions of this Act. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Persico for the purpose of legislative intent. Mr. Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Persico: "Representative, in Telecommunications Committee last night I posed the question whether any provision if found to be unconstitutional under State or Federal Law or preempted under Federal Law could be severed from the remaining valid provisions found in the Bill. Is it the intention of the General Assembly to make House Bill 2900 a severable Act of the General Assembly if, for example, Section 13-712 is found unconstitutional under State or Federal Law or preempted under Federal Law?"

Hamos: "Representative Persico, the short answer to your question is 'yes'. After conferring with the chief Senate Sponsors of House Bill 2900, Senators Sullivan and Mahar, and also the Bill's other cosponsors earlier today, it is clear that this General Assembly intends for House Bill 2900 to be a severable Act should a court determine that any Section or subdivision of any Section violate State or Federal Law or is preempted under Federal Law. In other words, if a court decides that Section 13-712 is violative of the State or Federal Law or Federal Constitution or is preempted by Federal Law or FCC

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

regulations or FCC orders, then all valid Sections and subdivisions of any Section of House Bill 2900 will remain in full effect. As guidance to any court that may visit the issue of severability for this Act, we, the General Assembly, believe and it is our intent that the court would sever that unconstitutional provision in accordance with the General Severability Provision provided in Section 1.31 of the Statute on Statutes. In addition, let me clarify that no Section or subdivision of any Section is intended to be so mutually connected with and dependent upon each other as to warrant the belief that the Legislature intended these Sections or its subdivisions under this Act to only exist as a whole. Therefore, we wanted to make it clear that this General Assembly would have passed this Act even if the later invalidated provision or provisions was absent from House Bill 2900."

Persico: "Thank you, Representative. Also, is it the intent of the General Assembly for the service quality standards found in Section 13-712 of House Bill 2900 to preempt or supersede the service quality standards imposed upon SBC-Ameritech under its Merger Order Agreement with the Illinois Commerce Commission or the Federal Communications Commission?"

Hamos: "No, it is not the intent of the General Assembly for the service quality standards found in Section 13 - 7112(sic-13-712) of House Bill 2900 to preempt or supersede the service quality standards already imposed SBC-Ameritech under its Merger Order Agreement with the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. It is the intent of the General Assembly for the service quality standards found in Section 13-712 to supplement or add to those service quality standards

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

SBC-Ameritech must already adhere to under its Merger Order Agreement with the ICC and the FCC."

- Persico: "Thank you and briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. stand in support on concurrence to House Bill 2900. is a Bill that was discussed over the previous 18 months and it was negotiated quite intensively for the past It was a Bill that many thought would probably never be called in this General Assembly. And it was through the hard work of the people on both sides of this aisle and the Senator, especially Senator Sullivan who got it back on from life support systems to finally bringing to the Senate Floor. And the staff on both sides, especially I'm speaking for Jennifer Ross on our side, who spent endless hours explaining to the Legislators on this side the complexity of this Bill. And so with that and to a previous questionnaire (sic-questioner), talking about whether there's gonna be guaranteed competition in this Bill, I guarantee if we don't pass this Bill there will be no competition in the State of Illinois. And so I support House Bill 2900 and concur with Amendments 3 and 4."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang, for the purpose of a disclosure and then we will go to Roll Call. Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I wish to disclose that I have a potential conflict of interest in this matter, but I will vote in the interests of my constituents and the citizens of the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Madigan: "The 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

- 69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001 declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 76?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 76 is on the Order of Nonconcurrence.

 A Motion to Recede from House Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to recede from House Amendment 1. What it did was, basically, make it a shell Bill and by taking it out, it'll go back to the substance it was before."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from House Amendment #1. Those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Excuse me. This is a final action Roll Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Black, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does recede from House this Bill, Amendment #1. And having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 694? 694, Senate. Supplemental #5, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 694, a Bill for an Act in relation to utilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, one more time. What are the status of the Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "There are no Amendments that have been approved for consideration, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.
 ... Saviano, SJR33."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 33 is a Resolution which creates a task force to study the fairness in contract in our medical professions. I want to commend everybody for coming together on this. We've got all the interested parties included in the Resolution. And I would ask for your approval."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of SJR33.

 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having... or this... the House does adopt SJR33. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1514, Supplemental Calendar #4?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1514 is on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. The First Conference Committee Report has been submitted."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Bugielski."

- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
 Bill 1514 is a Conference Committee Report. This is the
 Bill that was the drive-off Bill for the gasoline, at the
 gasoline stations. And all we did was add the word
 'knowingly' in front of driving off from the gas station.
 And that was a concern that was in the Senate to make sure
 that the word 'knowingly drive off' was added. And I ask
 for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1514.

 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ... Mr. Hannig wish to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1514. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 989. What is the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 989 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Schoenberg, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg on Amendment #2."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 989, a Bill for an Act concerning intergovernmental cooperation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 989, as amended, provides for establishing greater clarification for participation in joint self-insurance pools. I know of no opposition to this for these intergovernmental agreements. The Department of Insurance has lifted their opposition with Amendment #1. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Help me understand. What kind of intergovernmental self-insurance pools? To do what?"

Schoenberg: "Well..."

Parke: "To purchase what?"

Schoenberg: "There's been a sense that not all recognized units of local government and public agencies in the state would have the opportunity to engage in joint self-insurance for their risks and to derive whatever necessary economies of result of intergovernmental agreements. scale as a Examples would include: municipal joint action agencies, housing authorities, regional development authorities, and intergovernmental public safety agencies such as regional dispatch centers. This originally came as a result of the Village of Alsip wanting to participate in an intergovernmental agreement for their 911 center."

Parke: "Are you doing this for the municipal... the Illinois

Municipal League or the Northwest Municipal Conference or

the DuPage County? Who are you doing this for? Who wants
this?"

Schoenberg: "The Illinois Public Risk Fund and the Village of Alsip are the proponents of the Bill and with the Amendment, which clarified what constituted a public agency, the Department of Insurance lifted any opposition that they might have."

Parke: "And as far as you know, the insurance industry and the Department of Insurance and the Municipal League are not in opposition and they are supportive or neutral?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct. There is no opposition. There had been some opposition suggested for Amendment #2 and that's why I decided to table it and let that issue live for

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

another day."

Parke: "Okay. Then... Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. The Sponsor yield? Will any of these potentially be dealing with work comp or occupational diseases, any of these pools created under the Act?"

Schoenberg: "Well, the... This would impact agencies that are jointly self-insured to protect against liability under worker's... the Worker's Compensation Act and the Worker's Occupational Diseases Act. What it essentially does is clarify, what indeed, constitutes a public agency member and the Department of Insurance came and wanted to clarify even further what constituted a public agency member by requiring that there be some tax or public dollars involved."

Mautino: "Would there be any... Are there audit standards built into... I'm not familiar with this form. Are there audit standards that are built in or reserve levels that are monitored by the Department of Insurance?"

Schoenberg: "Just that... Yes."

Mautino: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The 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? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: " ... Clerk, Committee Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 279; 'recommendation for adoption' of House Amendment #1 to House Resolution 387; 'recommendation for adoption' for Amendment #1 to House Resolution 399; and 'recommendation for adoption' of House Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1234. Representative Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 10. Representative Shirley Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 694. Representative Novak, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' House Resolution 405 and House Resolution 428. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken 2001, reported the same back with the following May 31, recommendation/s: 'recommendation for concurrences Motions' Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 263 and Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3566."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2157, Representative Crotty on the Concurrence Motion."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Crotty: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2157. It still retains the original Bill's language on House Bill 2157. The Senate has added four House Bills all dealing with teacher pensions that has already passed the House and those Bills are: House Bill 1994, the Sponsor was Representative Saviano, House Bill 835, Representative Murphy, House Bill 1716, Representative Durkin is the Sponsor and House Bill 1464, Representative Wojcik is the Sponsor. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer those."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2157,

Senate Amendment #1? The Chair recognizes Representative

Parke."

Parke: "Now, this affects the Chicago Teachers' Fund?"

Crotty: "House..."

Parke: "And you've merged other Amendment... other Bills into this?"

Crotty: "Yes. My understanding is the Senate sent this back with... as a full package with all the Chicago pension Bills or any Chi... any teacher pension Bills put on this Bill. That's all it is."

Parke: "Mr. Speaker."

Crotty: "And all those Bills have already passed the House."

Parke: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Just a second. Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear what she's saying."

Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please. We've got a lot of work to do tonight. Let's tone it down."

Parke: "Representative Schoenberg, I cannot see the speaker.

Could... I'm sorry. Thank you. Go ahead. Go ahead,

proceed."

Crotty: "Yes, Representative. What the Senate has done is sent

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

this Bill back and added all the other pension Bills that we already passed from the House. They attached them to this Bill and sent it back. And I am concurring with it."

Parke: "Have you created any windows in this? Are there any legislative windows..."

Crotty: "No."

Parke: " ... that have been opened in this?"

Crotty: "No. They're all the same Bills that we voted on, sent over there, and they decided to put them all on this Bill and send it back. And I'm concurring with it."

Parke: "Do you know if it, in all aspects of this pension Bill that affects whatever pension systems, that those systems have agreed to all of these provisions?"

Crotty: "Yes, there is no opposition to this. Thank you."

Parke: "Do you know if this increases any of the unfunded liability to these pension funds?"

Crotty: "No, it does not."

Parke: "Then I guess... And the Chicago Teachers Union is in favor of this?"

Crotty: "Yes, they are."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Crotty: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black. He declines recognition.

Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady will yield."

Brunsvold: "Representative Crotty, does this provision include the 150 days, before it was a hundred?"

Crotty: "Yes, it does. That was House Bill 1994 that passed the House. That is here."

Brunsvold: "So, does that mean that as a Chicago teacher I can

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

draw my retirement, my full retirement, and teach for 150 days which is..."

Crotty: "Instead of a hundred."

Brunsvold: " ... almost a full year."

Crotty: "Instead of a hundred days, yes. And that..."

Brunsvold: "A full year would be 186 days. Is that right?"

Crotty: "No. Retired teachers can work up to... Now, with this Bill, 150 days instead a hundred days in the school year without losing any of your retirement benefits."

Brunsvold: "So, now they can work 150, if we pass this Bill."

Crotty: "If you would like to."

Brunsvold: "Yeah. So, they are basically drawin' two salaries."

Crotty: "Well, they were able to work up to a hundred days, now it's 150 days. And it's beneficial not only to that retiree, but it's also very beneficial to school districts because right now we're having a crisis in trying to find substitute teachers."

Brunsvold: "So, the teachers' unions, I guess, then do not object to retired people coming back into the system and maybe they're not putting any active teacher out of work."

Crotty: "Absolutely not. They're in favor of this. They support it. I have no opposition at all on any of these Bills coming back."

Brunsvold: "Are they getting the regular pay or are they getting reduced pay?"

Crotty: "I think that would be up to each school district and what they're contracting for..."

Brunsvold: "So much a day according to sub pay standards."

Crotty: "In that school district."

Brunsvold: "Substitute teacher, sub pay standards."

Crotty: "That's right."

Brunsvold: "'Cause some unions don't allow their members, once

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

retired, to come back and work in the field. And evidently, there's a need here and I understand that, but you know, if they're putting another active teacher out of work, you know, sometimes that becomes a problem. Thank you, Representative."

Crotty: "You're welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Committee (sic-Senate) Amendment #1 does have a liability to it. I believe, that our analysis says there's a \$63 million unfunded liability to this system. So, the statement, well, that this does not have a accrued liability, I think, might be false for that particular Amendment. Part of this is dealing with the teacher shortage in Chicago. This is not only gonna be applicable for Chicago, but also for the rest of the state later on. I think this Bill addresses a tremendous need of bringing veteran teachers back. There are a variety of provisions in this Bill, many of which are positive. There is a cost to this, but understand also this is the Chicago teachers. It does not deal directly with state funds."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Crotty to close."

Crotty: "Thank you very much. And I also want to sort of piggyback on what Representative Hoeft said. Again, there's no liability to the State of Illinois. It is from the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund and they are in full agreement. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2157?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 3 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2157. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Concurrence Calendar appears House Bill 2367, Representative Smith. On Senate Amendment #1. Mr. Smith on Amendment #1."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which simply added a few changes to the Senate's request to the University Retirement System to allow repayment of refund by inactive members and also to authorize receipt of more than one disabled survivor annuity. I know of no opposition. I would again move to concur."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Amendment #1? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt... pass... 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2367?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins. Representative Collins, would you care to vote on this? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2367. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Concurrence Calendar appears House Bill Representative O'Brien on Senate Amendment #1."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill... House Bill 2844, as

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

amended by the Senate, makes significant changes to the way the Department of Corrections handles their It adds a lot of requirements of parole or procedures. mandatory supervised release requiring reporting to an agent of the Department of Corrections, permitting a parole agent to visit the parolee or releasee at his or her home or employment or anywhere else to the extent necessary for the parole agent to do their duties, to report all arrests to an agent of the Department of Corrections as soon as permitted by the arresting authority, obtaining permission of an agent of the Department of Corrections before leaving the State of Illinois, obtaining permission of an agent of Department of Corrections before changing your residence, changing your employment, consenting to a search of his or her person, property or residence, refraining from the use or possession of narcotics or other controlled substances, not frequenting places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, administered and not knowingly associating with other persons on parole or mandatory release. This Bill creates these new conditions as a part of the overall revamp of the mandatory supervised parole system and release as administered by the Illinois Department of Corrections. I know of no opposition to this. And I would urge your 'aye' vote in that concurrence."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2844

Senate Amendment #1? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Mary Kay, very quickly and to the point. I've risen on this issue. I have a concern about staffing in the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Department of Corrections. I believe a court just ruled that we are liable for some \$20 million in overtime pay for parole agents and here is a Bill that gives parole officers more responsibility. I don't remember anywhere in the budget where we're adding parole officers."

O'Brien: "Representative Black, this is the initiative of the Department of Corrections and this is the compromise and the thing that was worked out with them when they revamped all of parole and mandatory supervised release and this is part of their initiative. So, it is something that is being sought by the Department, very aggressively sought by the Department, in the waning hours of this Session."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. Based on that, I'm gonna vote for the Bill. But you and I both know that we can't continue to put more responsibilities on our parole officers and our correctional officers, given our staffing levels and the fact that we have just lost a court case mandates that we may have to pay up to \$20 million in overtime. So, at some point, let's stop this merry-go-round and add sufficient people to get the job done. I like what your Bill does, but at some point, we're gonna need more people to do the job that should be done in the first place."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Representative Black. And I was just informed by Representative Beaubien that the budget, the upcoming budget, will double the number of parole officers and we have provided for that in the budget."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2844?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2844. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2845 on Concurrence Motion, Senate Amendment #1, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2845 would add the director of the Illinois Department of Corrections to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board. He's not included currently, and all of law enforcement felt that since he is one of the chief law enforcement officials in the State of Illinois that he should be included in this. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Amendment #1?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

Bill 2845?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes';

those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Mitchell, would you care to vote

on this? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,

there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0

voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2845. And this Bill, having

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

passed. Senate Bill 118, Representative Morrow. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 118, the Bill's been read a second time, previously and held on the Order of Second Reading

- 69th Legislative Day

 May 31, 2001

 pending the filing of a state mandates note. A balanced

 budget note and a Home Rule note have been requested on the

 Bill, as amended, and have not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "They will remain on Second Reading.

 Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Motion is inapplicable."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman has moved that the Motion is inapplicable. Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Well, with all due respect to the Sponsor, we need to object to that, Mr. Speaker. I mean, these are... We're creating a new creature called subcircuits in the collar counties something we've never heard about. It's only fair that we get some of these analysis as to cost, et cetera. And certainly, we need to debate the Bill, we've got plenty of time, but we need to at least get these answered."
- Speaker Hartke: "This Motion requires 60 votes. The Motion on the floor is by Representative Morrow that the notes are inapplicable. All those in favor of Mr. Morrow's Motion vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 65 Members voting 'yes', 52 Members voting 'no'. And the notes are ruled inapplicable. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 118, a Bill for an Act concerning judges. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that there's some people that are opposed to Senate Bill 118 and that's their right to be opposed. And I have no problem with them filing these state mandates Act

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

(sic-note) on this Bill three hours ago. That's the process that we have to go through, I have no problem. have the State Mandates Act. It says that Senate Bill 118 doesn't apply to it. But what I am against, if you wanna file a note, file the notes all at once. Don't file one note three hours ago and then file another note after we file this note. That's not fair. That's not fair. could have made the Motion three hours ago that the state mandates note was inapplicable, but I'm about fairness in this process. I've been around too long to play these games. It's all about if you got the votes and if you don't have the votes. Not only do I have the votes to pass this Bill on this side of the aisle, I got enough votes on the other side of the aisle. So, I move for passage of Senate Bill 118. We know what's in the Bill. If someone says that the... How can we come up with a subcircuit? Well, if you look at the Constitution of the State of Illinois, we have the authority to create a subcircuit. Ten years ago you had no problem creating subcircuits in Cook County. But now, as the population has shifted, is it fair that people on the bench in these counties that we're creating a subcircuit in, is it not fair that people who have moved from Cook County to those counties have the same opportunity to have a diverse representation on the bench? So, I urge 'green' votes on Senate Bill 118. hate the player, hate the game."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

Cross: "Represen... or Mr. Speaker, we'd ask for a verification.

Apparently..."

Speaker Hartke: "The request will be granted."

Cross: " ... that since there are no votes... Let me just ask the speaker a couple questions and I will not belabor the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

point. I know we've been here... Representative, in all seriousness and I know the subcircuit issue is an important one in Cook County and I respect that. But my understanding is no one in the collar counties came to you and said, Representative, let's add subcircuits in the collar counties. Is that correct?"

Morrow: "Representative Cross, ten years ago no one came to us and asked us to create subcircuits in Cook County. We created it because we wanted to bring diversity to the bench in Cook County and we're asking to create subcircuits in DuPage, Will, Lake, and McHenry because we want to reflect that same diversity in those counties, also."

Cross: "Well, and Charles, again, and I respect what you do and you do a good job, but the point is, in situations like this it's a general rule the judges, state's attorneys, public defenders, those involved with the court system will say there's a need to do this, there's a need to do it this way, we need more judges, we need subcircuits. No one's done that in the collar counties. There's really not a need to do it in the collar counties. If there was a... If you had done this in a separate way to take care of Cook, I could understand that. But the fact that you've included the collar counties creates a real, real problem for those of us in downstate Illinois and in the collar counties and there's absolutely no reason why we should be voting for this Bill. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Morrow to close."

Morrow: "Well, I'm gonna be brief in my closure because he said... the previous Gentleman, who I have a lot of respect for, said that there was no need. Well, I tell you what.

My original Bill, my original Bill was to create six additional judges in the subcircuits of Cook County.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Representative Cross, Representative Cross, ya hear me? Sir, can I have some order in the House?"

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh, please."

Morrow: "My original Bill created six additional judges in only the subcircuits of Cook County. Do you know how this became a statewide increase in judges? Because many of the Members on that side of the aisle, this side of the aisle, and in the Senate chamber said, 'Representative Morrow, include me. You wanna increase the judges in Cook County, include me.' So, we've included you. And now I'm hearin', well, nobody talked to me about subcircuits. Well, I tell Why don't we go back to the original Bill, put you what. six additional judges in the subcircuits of Cook County and leave all you guys off the Bill? Then what excuse would you have? You put too many judges in Cook County. We want judges in our circuits. As my grandmother told me a long time ago, it don't take much to be a cowboy. All you gotta do is be smarter than the cow. Put 'green' votes on Senate Bill 118."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 118?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Please vote your own switches. There has been a request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 47 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. Mr. Cross, do you persist in your verification?"

Cross: "Would Representative Morrow like me to withdraw it or does he want me to persist?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Morrow."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Morrow: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Yes, Sir."

Morrow: "I have a lot of respect for you, but I couldn't hear you 'cause it... you know, I don't know what you have in your mouth. Is it cud or..."

Cross: "I asked, Representative Morrow, would you like me to withdraw that verification request. I think you won."

Morrow: "In all seriousness, Representative Cross, you and I have a lot of respect for each other."

Cross: "You bet we do."

Morrow: "If you want to rewithdraw the Motion, I'm in favor of it."

Cross: "All right. I'll withdraw the request."

Morrow: "Thank you, Representative Cross."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you."

Morrow: "You're a man of honor."

Speaker Hartke: "And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Righter."

Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect that I voted 'present' on Senate Bill 118 for reasons of potential conflict of interest. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "It'll reflect in the records. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 479?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 479 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

Mr. Murphy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 479 has been read a second time, previously. Committee Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. A Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1 has been recommended for adoption."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recede from Senate... House Amendment #1 from Senate Bill 479."

Speaker Hartke: "Your Motion is to Table the Motion."

Murphy: "I move to table..."

Speaker Hartke: "Table..."

Murphy: " ... Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 479."

Speaker Hartke: "The Amendment is tabled. Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We're in total support of the Gentleman's Motion to Table."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is tabled.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. No further Motions."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 479, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 469 (sic-479) we intend to pass it as its original form that came from the Senate and also passed..."

Speaker Hartke: "Please, Ladies and Gentlemen. Proceed."

Murphy: " ... that passes... passed the Senate and also came out of the House Personnel Commission (sic-Committee). We would move to approve 479 in its original form."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Hoeft."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Hoeft: "The essence of this is to increase the number of board members on the insurance... excuse me... on the pension board for the Cook County and the forest preserve, correct?"

Murphy: "That's correct."

Hoeft: "And this is the only insur... pension system in the State of Illinois that doesn't have annuitants on it, so these are annuitants. Those are individuals who are participating in the system. This is the thrust of the Bill, is it not?"

Murphy: "That's correct."

Hoeft: "Therefore, I think, it's a good Bill and should be unanimously accepted."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong support of the Bill in its original form. It does nothing except add two members to the Cook County Employees and Forest Preserve Pension Board. That's all it does. We've done it a hundred times for every board in here. And those two new board members are retirees which we've done for most of our pension system. In this form, it's a good Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 479?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 479. And this Bill, having

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence Motion is House Bill 2432, Representative Kenner. On Senate Amendment #1 or 1, 2, and 4."

Kenner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 4. And primarily, the Senate in their infinite wisdom made two changes with the Bill. The first one being that they made the Bill only applicable to the City of Chicago. And the second Amendment removes the ability of the CHA to acquire land with mortgage revenue bond proceeds. I would move the passage of these Senate Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, as far as you know, is there any groups in opposition to this?"

Kenner: "None that I'm aware of, no."

Parke: "And one more time, this affects the Chicago Housing Authority only?"

Kenner: "This only affects the Chicago Housing Authority. The Senate took the rest of the state out of it, so maybe you might have some housing authorities in other parts of the state that might be against that, but this only affects the City of Chicago, CHA."

Parke: "Does this... It says that the authority of mortgage revenue bonds for development of multifamily rental housing. Is there a cap on how much... on how many bonds that can be issued?"

Kenner: "Not that I'm aware of. No, there's no cap."

Parke: "And this is backed by who? Who's backing these revenue

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

bonds? The City of Chicago?"

Kenner: "This is an initiative by CHA and as I said earlier, the
 rest of the..."

Parke: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I cannot hear the Gentleman."

Speaker Hartke: "Again, please, Ladies and Gentlemen. Shhh."

Kenner: "Representative Parke, this is an initiative by CHA, Chicago Housing Authority. And as I stated earlier, the housing authorities were taken out and next year we're gonna try to include them, too."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Just very briefly, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I appreciate the efforts of Representative Kenner in trying to expand these bonds to downstate housing authorities where we also have the need. The Gentleman has given his word, he will work with us next year. This is a good idea. It's the wave of the future. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 4 to House Bill 2432?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Smith. ... take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 4 to House Bill 2432. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 113?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 113 has been read a second time,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Andrea Moore, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore on Amendment #3."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw Amendment #3, please."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative

Andrea Moore, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Floor Amendment #5 amends the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act to permit a manufacturer to pay its dealers uniform warranty imbursement... line, make a reimbursement. Under current law, Illinois franchisee... vehicle dealers can request that a retail rate be paid by the manufacturers for any parts that are used in warranty repairs by that dealer. SB113 permits the manufacturer, if it so chooses, to reach an agreement with its dealers of each line to make a pay... to be made to pay a uniform warranty reimbursement rate instead of the retail rate. This is an agreed piece of legislation that's a result of several months of negotiations between Ford Motor Company, General Motors, and the IADA. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise in support of the Amendment. This is the result of negotiations on a shell Bill that Leader Daniels sponsored and Speaker Madigan was cosponsor and allowed me to move out to the Senate. This isn't the same Bill, but it's the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

same concept. And because of your kindness we were able to get this worked out. The Lady has worked very hard. This is agreed language between the automobile manufacturers and the dealers. And I really urge and ask you for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor

Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 113?' All those in favor

signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 113, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I explained, Floor Amendment #5 became the Bill as we've just explained. And if you have any further questions, I'd be happy to answer."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Will the Speaker yield? Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Garrett: "Representative Moore, I just want to make sure that this particular Bill is not the school bus driver background."

Moore: "No. Floor Amendment #5 has become the Bill and all the other language is gone."

Garrett: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate
Bill 113?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes';
those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 113. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2703, Representative Currie. 2703. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2703 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2703, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This merely provides that former Members of the General Assembly may buy up to two years of SERS credit to apply to the General Assembly Retirement System as with current Members of the General Assembly they would be required to pay the full employer and employee costs plus interest. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I'd appreciate your support for passage of the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, this is a window for General Assembly Members for what system?"

Currie: "It is an opportunity for former Members of the General Assembly to take credit in the SERS system up to two years to apply to the General Assembly Retirement System under exactly the same terms and conditions that apply to you. That is to say that they'd have to pay the full employer cost, the full employee cost plus any interest charges.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

So, all it does is to say former Members have the same opportunity of transfer as current Members."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoeft."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Hoeft: "The question comes down to a window. You would not portray this as a legislative window?"

Currie: "I would not. I would just say that we're treating equally, on the same footing as we treat you, former Members of the Assembly with respect to the transfer of SERS credit to the General Assembly System."

Hoeft: "It's important to re-emphasize the fact there are three components of payment: employee, employer, and interest.

All three are being met. The..."

Currie: "All three would have to be met at full cost."

Hoeft: "The unfunded liability to the system would net out to be zero."

Currie: "Just about."

Hoeft: "This is something, again, that I think is just and proper. We should vote for it."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Just real briefly, to the previous speakers and I think to characterize that this is any type of window and I understand that, I think, it was cleared up by the Sponsor would be a mischaracterization. All we're saying is, with regard to SERS, you would have the same opportunity to pay the employer, the employee, and the interest. And this would not be characterized as a window. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Wojcik: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wojcik: "Representative, just to clarify my thought. Would this allow a former employ... a former Legislator, who already is receiving a pension, to buy in?"

Currie: "No, once you're retired, that's it. But this would permit somebody before retirement to add to the GARS system just as you can do, two years, as you can do today at the same cost... full cost."

Wojcik: "Okay, fine. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2703?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does pass House Bill 2703. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3566, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. For Daniels."

Daniels: "Did he read the Bill?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Daniels: "Okay. House Bill 3566 tightens up the use of reading improvement block grant funds to focus on research-based instruction in early grades similar to what passed the House. It passed the House where it was up to twelfth grade, the Senate didn't like it. They limited it to sixth grade. And I would ask to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on this Senate Amendment

69th Legislative Day

- May 31, 2001
- #1? The Chair recognizes Representative Davis, Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Davis, M.: "Mr... Representative Daniels, you want to tell us what that Senate Bill does... the Senate Amendment."
- Daniels: "I just explained it."
- Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."
- Daniels: "Okay. What it does is it changes the reading improvement block grant to focus on research-based instruction in early grades."
- Davis, M.: "It changes the reading block grant from fourth grade to sixth grade?"
- Daniels: "As I said earlier, it changes it to sixth grade. When it passed the House, almost unanimously, it was to twelfth. The Senate didn't like it to twelfth. They changed it to sixth. The State Board of Education favors this. Asked that you support it. Vote 'yes'."
- Davis, M.: "We support it, Representative Daniels. And thank you for that elaborate explanation."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3566?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3566. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rules Report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Rules Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' to the Order of Concurrence House Bill 3489, House Bill 3491, House Bill 3493, House Bill 2125, House Bill 3050 and House Bill 3440; 'to the floor for consideration' Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 435."

Speaker Hartke: "Senate Bill 839, Representative Bost. You have a Motion."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to recede from House Amendments #1, 2, and 3 on Senate Bill 839."

Speaker Hartke: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendments 1, 2, and 3?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question... 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does recede from Senate... House Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 839. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Resolution 405, Representative Novak. Out of the record. House Bill 279, Representative Giles on the Concurrence Motion. Please explain the Amendment."

Giles: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 279. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to refer to Representative Burke to explain the Amendment #1."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Burke on the Amendment."

Burke: "Thank you, Representative Giles. Thank you, Speaker and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Gentlemen. Let first indicate for and me legislative intent that House Bill 279 and the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendments this legislation does not create the requirement that a dispatcher of emergency vehicles for ambulances, fire, or police is required to be a certified emergency medical dispatcher. However, emergency medical vehicle is dispatched and prearrival support instructions are provided, the individual dispatcher must be an emergency medical dispatcher and that person must be certified by the Department of Public Health or have received a waiver from the Department of Public Health. Also, the emergency medical dispatcher must follow the EMDR... EMDPRS protocol used by that 911 facility and if the protocol requires the emergency medical dispatcher to give prearrival support instructions then the dispatcher must follow those protocols. With respect to Amendment #1 to Senate Amendment #1, it proposes changes to the current EMS Systems Act that reflect nationally accepted and practiced standards. And I think, that would probably about do it. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 279?' All in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 279. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill... On Concurrence Motions,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

there's House Bill 2125 on Supplemental Calendar #6.
Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the General Obligation Bond Act. It increases in authorization of the general authorization of bonds to 15,265,705 (sic-15,265,007,500). This does deal with our general obligation bonding for purposes on authorization for educational purposes, correctional facilities, open space, child care facilities, mental health, cargo handling facilities in port districts, water resource facilities, grants for the Secretary of State, land acquisition, moneys for state agencies for grants to local governments, the Illinois Open Land Trust Program, transportation dollars, for our highway system, for use of Chicago urbanized areas within Chicago and outside and in the collar counties and downstate. And most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this contains \$500 million for coal and energy development for the State of Illinois which I'm proud to be part of the sponsorship. I ask your favorable support. This is a great Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

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

I would just rise in support of this important Bill. This
has been reviewed by the staff. It's been reviewed by
Members of the Appropriation Committees. And I'd ask for a
'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2125?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2125. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental #6 appears House Bill 3050, Amendments #1 and 2. Mr. Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I wish to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3050. 3050 is the... amends the School Code, it deals with the school formula. In fact, it raises the foundation. It does three things. It raises the foundation level to \$4,560. This is an increase of about over \$135 over the last year's amount. It also uses a three-year average of daily attendance. This is especially useful for those districts that are losing children as a result of population shifts and declining enrollment. also changes the way we compute the poverty grant. allows more schools to receive the poverty grant and in many cases, this will mean an increase in poverty money, something that is surely needed for many of our rural and inner-city districts. And it allows for a continuing appropriation of state aid for those districts and it holds them harmless for an additional year. If there's any shortcoming in this legislation, I would say that that increase poverty funds probably should be directed specifically for a particular program or follow the child, but at least now it will follow the particular children. In terms of the changes in the poverty grant, there's some 55,000 children, additional children, who will be helped as a result in this change from 0 to the 20 percentile. EFAB advisory board recommended this partic... adopted this particular change. And I would like to commend the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

cosponsor of this Bill, Representative Julie Curry and the chair of the Education-Aprop Committee and Representative Jerry Mitchell because it was the combination of all three Bills that came back from the Senate that included all of these ideas. I want to thank Governor Ryan and him creating the committee to study the school formula question. As you know, this is just a small step towards addressing the inequities in school... that currently exist in school funding. And I'm proud that we're doing something this year to try to help provide more funds for those many needed districts throughout the state. And I move for the adoption of... I should say, I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of Representative Turner's Bill. It has been a long, hard pull. One of the most important features of this Bill is the fact that every single school district will now receive money for those children that are living in poverty. It makes no difference what your percentage, you will get that and that is forever. That will be mandated. That's not something we'll prorate. So, I wish there were more money for every category, but this is one category that everybody benefits in. I also urge a strong 'aye' vote from everyone. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Curry."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in strong support of this legislation. I'd like to thank Representative Turner and Representative Jerry Mitchell for their help over the last year. The poverty grant has been one issue that I have worked on now for three years because of the disparity in many poor districts throughout this

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

state. This legislation puts a significant amount of money into the poverty grant, correcting many of the problems that were created nearly four years ago. I think that we are going to be able to help so many districts throughout this state through the changes in this legislation. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3050?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3050. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3489, Representative Hannig on Senate Amendment #2."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Build Illinois Bond Authorization Act and it increases the authorization by \$689 million.

 And I'd be happy to answer any question. And I'd move for passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3049 (sic-3489)?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3049 (sic-3489). And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3491, Representative Hannig on Senate Amendment #1."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Budget Implementation Act. And let me briefly read some of the highlights. It provides for emergency rule making for the budget itself. It provides for a Special Education Matching Fund to be set up so that we can collect money through the Illinois Department of Public It creates a Drug Rebate Fund so we have a place for Aid. money that we will receive from Public Aid on the required Federal Medicaid Laws. There's a Downstate Emergency Response Fund that's to receive money to be paid to the Department of Transportation for the helicopters for hospitals. There's a new category in the Excellence in Academic Medicine Act. And it also provides that for the nursing home rate increases. It also has the Circuit Breaker Pharmaceutical Assistance Medicaid Waiver. Tt. extends for an additional year the services to legal immigrants and permits the State Comptroller to transfer Medicaid reimbursements into the new Drug Rebate Fund. amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act to coverage beginning July 1, 2001 for any prescription drug used in the treatment of osteoporosis. And it has early intervention quality review, private insurance, and family fees. This is a companion to Senate Bill 461, which we passed earlier. So, those are the provisions of the Bill.

I'd move that the House concur in the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3491?' those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3491. this Bill, having received the And Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3493, Representative Hannig on Senate Amendment #2."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a budget implementation Bill. The first item deals with the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. provides that \$5 million shall be transferred into the fund from the General Revenue Fund and also makes \$5 million available to McCormick Place. These transfers shall be authorized for fiscal years 2002 through 2007. It provides language so the General Assembly Members can buy our old chairs here in the House and the Senate as they begin the process of getting new chairs. It provides some additional language to the Space Needs Commission and it does some clarifications in the budget stabilization transfer. it has some Statistical Services Revolving Fund transfers in that need to be done as well. It allows the Public Utility Fund to have a maximum balance of 5 million instead of \$2.5 million. And it amends the Illinois Income Tax Act so that we can continue the Earned Income Tax Credit that we began last year. Those are the highlights of the Bill. I'd ask that we concur in the Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Question to the Sponsor."

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Mautino: "In the transfer between the cigarette tax which is 4.8 million, to the Tourism Promotion Fund which will be the \$5 million, will that have any impact on the current program or where those funds coming from?"
- Hannig: "Representative, this part of the Bill actually authorizes a \$5 million transfer from General Revenue into the Promotion and Tourism Fund."
- Mautino: "Okay. So, that would be... So, then the existing program of tourism promotion which is divided into two funds, international tourism and Tourism Promotion Fund, would remain at its current level, no program cuts, but GRF would replace that, it's an add-on?"
- Hannig: "So, we are aware of another proposal to spend the \$5 million with McCormick Place. And this would make the fund whole, this transfer."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3493?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3493. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Berns..."

Berns: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Hartke: " ... for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Berns: " ... on House Bill 3491, I intended to vote 'yes'. Would the record so reflect..."

Speaker Hartke: "The record will reflect your wishes in the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Journal. House Bill 3440, Representative Hannig on Senate
Amendment #1."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expense budget of State of Illinois. Before I begin, I'd like to thank Representative Daniels and Representative Ryder, spokesman on the Republican side, and the staff on the Republican side for their cooperation and fine work. also like to thank the Speaker and the Chairmen of the Appropriation Committees and the Members on both sides of the aisle for the hard work that they put in in beginning the process of flushing out the budget, as well as John Lowder and the House Appropriation staff on my side of the aisle. All these people have done an awful lot of work to get us from when the Governor first introduced the budget to where we stand here today. Let me briefly talk about some of the issues that we have in the budget and then I'll be happy to answer any questions. We have 51% of new General Revenue Funds goes to education. That's split up between 303 million for elementary and secondary and 157 for higher ed. We're going to maintain a year-end balance of \$1.2 million... \$1.2 billion. The budget provides for a dollar an hour increase for the DD community providers, retroactive to March 1 of 2001; a long-term rate increase for nursing homes, beginning July 1, 2001; a 2% cost of doing business adjustment for all community providers beginning April 1st. We maintain a 30-day payment cycle, no cut to any base rates to any provider. And we'll restore 22 million that was cut from the pharmaceuticals by administrative rule earlier in the year. A few of the other highlights include funding for the AgriFIRST Program, includes 2.4 million increase in the coal technology and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

development, a million dollars for alternative fuels. heard about the education funding earlier. There's money in financial institutions to deal with predatory lending rules. Nearly 18 million increase for the MAP Program, which provides needs-based scholarships for scholarships, \$3 million for about 150 new CILAs phased in throughout the year, and about \$50 million for tobacco, for cigarette, for smoking prevention and cessation programs, generally So, those are through the Department of Public Health. most of the highlights. There are obviously, are many, many more, but those are most of the highlights that are in this Bill. I think that the budget that we've crafted in a bipartisan spirit today is a good budget. It's the best that we can do with the money that is available, in my view. And so, I would move for the... move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and that we send this budget to the Governor's desk for his consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Giles."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Giles: "Representative Hannig, one of the concerns I always have, and that is with the Department of Corrections. I'm looking at the budget for the Corrections. I think it's \$1.3 billion, is that correct? For..."

Giles: "Okay, and I'm looking here where it has about a 9% change from la... from FY001, is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes. I'm on the same page with you now, Representative.

It's about... GRF went up 8.5%."

Giles: "Okay. In this budget, do we have any moneys appropriated

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

for the two prisons that were mentioned, I believe the Stateville Correctional Center and Thomson Correctional Facility? Is there any funds in this budget that will proceed with building those facilities or expanding those facilities?"

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, the Thomson Correctional Center..."

Giles: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear him."

Speaker Hartke: "Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's give our attention to the speakers."

Hannig: "Okay, Representative, the 2.178 was reduced from Stateville Correctional Center and this will delay the opening of that facility. The actual appropriation, I think, thought it would open in June of next year. And then the Thomsonal (sic-Thomson) Correctional schedule (sic-Center) was scheduled to open in the spring of '02. This has been deleted from the budget since it's not prepared to open in '02. It will open in '03."

Giles: "Okay."

Hannig: "And so those two prisons were actually near the end of the '02 fiscal year, they were scheduled to open and it now appears that they're probably not ready to open anyway, so we've simply taken the money out of the budget."

Giles: "And I see here, also, where there were some expansion dollars in this Bill towards the Lawrence facility and the Kewanee facility in which I'm looking at here, where it says, 2,257 new beds for Lawrence and 420 new beds for Kewanee, is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, these opened in '01, but not in the beginning of the year. So, we have to annualize the cost. That is, this will...'02 will be the first year that we pay for the full 12 months. And that's why there's

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

additional expenses associated with those facilities."

Giles: "Okay. Thank you, thank you, Representative. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Giles: "I guess I'm always looking at the Department οf Correction and of course, its expansion of beds. Once again, you know, now we have the budget as, for this year for the Department of Correction, is \$1.3 billion and I'm sure, or either \$1.4 billion. And look like every year since I've been here, since 1993, this budget has grown tremendously, and it continues to grow. And I'm gonna stand here every year and make this argument, why we continue to increase this budget, we must continue to look at ways that will pro act and so that we can get a handle on this budget to make sure that we address the issues of recidivism, we address the issues of individual getting treatment so that they will not come back into the penal This is a great concern. This budget's gonna system. continue to grow, and I just want us to take notice of this budget and hopefully, we can begin to really address the issues. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Representative Hannig, what's the total GRF inside of this Bill?"

Hannig: "23... about 23,450... 23 billion, 450 million."

Mautino: "And all funds... total budget?"

Hannig: "Yeah, we're pushing about 52 billion for all funds, Representative."

Mautino: "52 billion."

Hannig: "About a billion a week."

Mautino: "Now, does that also... on the capital side, capital projects contained in the two previous bonding Bills, total

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

of 1.2... 1.3?"

- Hannig: "The budget includes the appropriation on those. In some cases, we've authorized the bonds that we have not yet committed, Representative, but..."
- Mautino: "So, a new capital program this year would be worth what?"
- Hannig: "It's about 2.2 or 3 billion, but that includes the general GO bonds and BUILD Illinois. It also includes the road bonds, transportation A and B, the school construction bond is \$740 million, so a number of proposals across the board in bonding."
- Mautino: "In funding the spending plan that we have in place here today, I know in past years, especially tight budget years, there had been some attempts to make transfers out of dedicated funds, road fund. Were there any transfers over and above the... normally, we allow 54 million state police and certain other transfers."
- Hannig: "Representative, there certainly were no transfers from dedicated funds outside of the normal course of transfers, as you said, that we generally allow statutorily. So, I would say that, no, there's no gimmicks or anything in this budget where we went in and took money out of any number of these dedicated funds in any fashion that's unusual or not ordinary for us to do. So, we have certain customary and ordinary things that we do do with the Secretary of State and the Department of Transportation for road moneys."
- Mautino: "Earlier on in the Session, we'd heard quite a bit about the hole in the budget that was created by the Medicaid and we were looking at \$270 million shortfall. How's that been addressed inside the budget?"
- Hannig: "The Governor took, we took some... onetime and some recurring efficiencies in Medicaid and we dedicated them to

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the plan. They actually reduced the pay... increased the payment cycle by two days, and they actually did some other transfers, normal transfers, within the systems to come up with another \$120 million. So, it's a number of about three different components that they put into plugging the And of course, the plan is or the hope is that the Federal Government and particularly our delegation out in Washington will help us get a better reimbursement rate than the 50/50 rate that we currently have. Should we be successful in that, then we'll be able to go forward with Medicaid funding increases in the future, but should that fail, frankly, these items would, some of which are onetime, will cause us to come back here in FY03 and have the same kind of crisis. These onetime fixes in the budget will reappear. So, we need to get a permanent solution. And that hope is that we can get that permanent solution with some help from Washington."

Mautino: "And hopefully, we'll do something as well. The... Was there anything included as far as we're facing the crisis with the retired teachers' insurance and has there anything been..."

Hannig: "Nothing beyond the normal contribution that the State of Illinois makes into the plan and the additional 11 million that we started making into the plan a couple, three years ago. So, but nothing beyond that, Representative."

Mautino: "Appreciate your answers."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We come to this time of the evening, at the end of Session, where we're taking a look at the budget and it's the agony and the ecstasy. I'm disappointed that 200 thousand working moms and dads in

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

this state are going to go another year without health insurance, and that we couldn't find \$7 million to get We have to get this done and we have FamilyCare started. to get it done as soon as possible. The previous speaker was talking about a congressional delegation bringing back a larger portion, 5% more for the State of Illinois in F match which will help us out a lot. But I also think that what we have to do is take a look at how we manage Medicaid and do a better job. The sooner we do this, the better. Yesterday, the State of New York was approved for FamilyCare in their state, which means \$100 million that we could have had if we employed FamilyCare, would have been in the budget, is going to the State of New York. going back to Washington and then going to New York. So, I hope that we can look to the future, to a bright future. Hopefully, what Representative Hannig talked about will come true and our Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, will try and help us the best he can to make this happen, so that in November, we can revisit this and enact FamilyCare for those 200 thousand working families in this state. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to follow up with what the previous speaker said. In a good news, bad news scenario, I found the \$7 million for FamilyCare, that's in the Tobacco Settlement Fund. The bad news is, that money's going to put in new parking lights at the Lincoln Log Cabin Historic Site. The money's going in for tuckpointing at the Appellate Court of the Third District. The money's going for hazardous material abatement and repairing minor problems and emergencies through the CDB. The money's going for tuckpointing at the Illinois Center for

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

The money's going to Ill... to upgrade Rehabilitation. laboratory systems. We are spending \$7.8 million out of the Tobacco Settlement Fund on improved parking lots, on tuckpointing, on capital projects while we are letting almost a quarter million individuals go without health insurance. It's not morally right. It's not ethically It's not sociologically right. It is not fiscally right to do. The money that we are not putting into FamilyCare now is costing us money down the road. And to take that money out of the Tobacco Settlement Fund adds insult to injury. It is bad enough, if we would shift that money from GRF and put it into something else other than where it should be going. We also have families down here. We saw men, women, their children, all affected by the lack of us having FamilyCare. They came down here, they plead their case to us over and over again, and we all told them that we would do whatever it is we could do to try to make it happen. And you take the Tobacco Settlement Fund, which are blessed to have, which should be used for we health-related purposes, and we take those dollars and we put it to light parking lots, and we take it to put in new concession facilities, instead of giving these people health insurance, so they can go to work, so they can be healthy, so they can be there for their kids. It's not the right thing to do. So, when you go back and you tell them that we could not find \$7 million, give them the We found the \$7 million and we found something else that we decided to do with it instead. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Gary, I want to start off, I want to thank you. I know

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

cosponsors the other you and have worked extraordinarily hard on this in this late hour. I know that you did the best job that you could. And I want to commend you on a lot of points here in the budget. I think new revenue for education, the 460 million, outstanding, and the \$1 wage increase is outstanding, and 250 million for the community college over five years is wonderful, and the Medicaid rate increase for the nursing homes is terrific. All those things are great. Now, I want to ask you about some things that I didn't see in there and I want to know if I missed 'em. As you know, we've had a shortfall in the retired teachers for their And they're told that there's gonna be a 45% insurance. premium increase. Has there been any money allocated in this budget to help our retired teachers?"

Hannig: "Representative, the State of Illinois makes a contribution to that health care plan equal to the contribution that active teachers make."

Franks: "Correct."

Hannig: "That contribution will be made again this year, plus an additional \$11 million, I believe. So, the state does make some contribution. The problem is that the contribution that the active teachers make only grows by 3 or 4% each year 'cause that's only... that's the amount of money they get in pay raises, more or less. The problem, though, is that medical costs, particularly prescription drugs, are going up at, you know, 10, 20, 25% and we've seen an imbalance arise between those people who are putting money into the system and those people who are asking for the benefits. And under the terms of the system as it was set up in 1995, the retired teachers promised that they would make up the balance. Now when that's a small amount,

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

increase in their premiums, it's not such a big deal. This year it's gonna be a big problem. That's why we're hopeful that over the summer we can try to come to some resolution on this problem that can solve this problem permanently and enact it when we come back into Veto Session."

Franks: "That's heartening, I appreciate that. Well, when you talked about the issue that's really driving the costs up, for all insurance plans and for our medical costs in this country, the biggest single gap we have is the problem with the increased prescription drug costs."

Hannig: "I agree."

Franks: "Now, is there anything in this budget that will expand prescription drug relief for our lowest income seniors?

Have we been able to raise the threshold for those that are available for Circuit Breaker?"

Hannig: "Well, we did add osteoporosis to the Circuit Breaker

Program this year. And the Circuit Breaker Program is

fully funded, but we didn't make any changes as far as the

thresholds on who qualifies this year. Although last year,

we made some very significant changes in the Circuit

Breaker Program."

Franks: "Right, but that's something I think we need to address, is increasing the Circuit Breaker, as well as passing our Bill to provide lower prescription drugs for all seniors in the state without any cost to the State of Illinois."

Hannig: "And Representative, that's one of the problems we have with Medicaid, as well. The cost of prescription drugs has gone up so rapidly that it's created this big hole in our Medicaid budget."

Franks: "I'm bitterly disappointed that we were unable to get that passed in the Senate, and hopefully, in the Veto we can. Has there been any funding increases for the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

community-based mental health providers?"

Hannig: "I believe that there's the 2% cost of doing business provisions that are in the Bill, will apply to many of those."

Franks: "The ones that start next April?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Franks: "Thank you. Do we have any account or any accountings...

I know when we passed the Illinois FIRST Program a few years ago, that it was supposed to have been a program that would be bonded over five years and we're into the third year now. Do we have any hard figures of what has been spent on those capital projects and how much is left to be spent?"

Hannig: "Most of your Illinois FIRST was a school construction..."

Franks: "Correct."

Hannig: " ... and a road construction program."

Franks: "And sewer and water, as well."

Hannig: "Yeah, there was some sewer and water and there were a few other lesser things in there, as well. But it was mostly road construction and school construction. We can get you an accounting of what's committed. Much of it was committed in the early years, even if not spent, as many road projects are still waiting their turn. I don't have that here on the tip of my tongue, Representative."

Franks: "I believe that, as well, that most of it was done up front, and I'm just wondering how much is still laying out there because now there's a real question of what further projects will be able to be done. And I think to be able to get a handle of what we can do, we need to know what's still available. I appreciate those answers. I guess my concern with this budget is now we've grown to \$52 billion

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

and when I came here a few years ago, our budget was approximately \$38 billion. So, we've grown over 25% in a short time, when the cost of living has only been about 5%. So, our budget's really grown about five times the rate of inflation and I'm worried that the people in the State of Illinois aren't gonna have a chance to ever get meaningful tax relief and that our property taxes are gonna continue to grow and that seniors are gonna be forced out of their homes. And what worries me about the budget process is when we sit here and we talk about the budget, we talk about it incrementally and we talk about the growth, the \$900 million this year, but actually it's more. Now we're at 52 billion, it's almost \$3 billion growth. But we never really get to the core of the budget. We never really get down to the lines and say, each agency, you have to defend what you're spending. And I'd just like to see in the future that we change this budget process and we really insist on more accountability. And I don't think that the State of Illinois, that the hard-working taxpayers, can continue to let budgets grow at five times the rate of inflation. I'm scared we're gonna bankrupt our grandchildren and I just want to look at fiscal restraint here and I just admonish the Body that we have to start thinking differently. And Mr. Hannig, I thank you very much for your forthrightful answers."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm gonna get directly to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Morrow: "Some of my colleagues have said that there were some things not in the budget that could have been funded. And

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

I agree with all the things that they said. FamilyCare could have been funded. And I'm gonna tell you how FamilyCare could have been funded. We got \$20 million for some dinosaur bones, in the budget. God bless Sue, but Sue been dead and buried 2 million years. Don't you think taxpayer dollars should go for the living and not the dead? Not some dead dinosaur bones, at least. So, the 20 million that we spending on some dinosaur bones could have paid for FamilyCare for the first year. But you know, we been told that we not gonna have Member initiative money. Well, whose Member initiative was Sue? I'll tell you who Member initiative it was. And I'm gonna insult some Members in this chamber when I say this. It's for the wine and cheese crowd. Now somebody says, 'Representative Morrow, what's a wine and cheeser?' Well, you know what, I'm gonna tell you some of there... and I'm gonna mention my good Repre... friend on the other side of the aisle, Representative Black. See, Representative Black and I are beer and shot Members. We're not wine and cheese Members. So, we won't invited to the Field Museum this summer when they have all the different receptions and Sue's in the background and you're taking a picture with Sue, and somebody says, 'Oh, Lord have mercy, you done brought Sue some money, let me write you a check. Let me write you a check for citizens for whoever, since I'm sitting here feeling so good that you bought \$20 million home for a dinosaur, a dead dinosaur.' 'Cause we got some dinosaurs in this chamber, they just happen to be living. So, we could have funded some other things. We could have given cost-of-living increase to TANF recipients, but we had to pay for some dinosaur bones. We need to change this appropriation process. There was a time when the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

appropriation process took long hours because there were real Floor Amendments. And everyone knew what everyone else was getting because you had to put your Amendment onto that agency Bill on the floor. Not in Committee. Not in a back room. So, we all holler and complain, 'Oh, we getting messed over because you all won't stand up.' Leaders and the Governor only do what they do to us because we let it happen. We let it happen, not the people of the State of Illinois. We let it happen. And I'm gonna tell you what, we never dealt with reapportionment this year. A third of you won't be back in 2002. A third of you won't be back. You think I'm kidding? I was around ten years that's why I went from 69th in seniority down to the 20s. You want to help your district? The only way you help your district is to survive down here. And the only way you survive down here is by standing up, standing up to whoever tells you that your community comes second to some dinosaur bones. And you stand up when you say, 'I'm fighting for my community.' There are so many other items that Representative Fritchey and Representative Franks put in there. So yeah, we don't have Member initiative money? Yeah, but Sue is somebody's Member initiative. Think about that when we go home. Think about the other programs we could have funded if we had not taken care of some dinosaur bones. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Lou Jones."

Jones, L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, Sue is in my district. I have not been able to visit Sue 'cause I've been down here for the last six or seven months. But you know, all jokes aside, it's really sad that I worked all year on one Bill, 3061, and it was the first time in the 14

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

years that I've been down here that I was able to get as much support on the other side of the aisle for that increase for public aid recipients as I did over here on my side of the aisle. And I want to thank you. I even had some on the other side of the aisle as cosponsors to the It was only \$31 million. The State of Illinois the states that was very successful in the TANF program. They put more people to work. There was only four other states in the Union that moved people from wel... more people to welfare to work than the State of Illinois, so it reduced the public aid rolls tremendously. And a 15% increase for these families in Illinois, where a family... excuse me, Charles... where a family of three live on \$377 a month, which breaks it down to \$4.13 a day. And it's kind of sad for me to go home tonight knowing that that dinosaur will go home with \$20 million and I'll have to come back here next year, which I will, and fight again for those people to get a 15% increase in public aid, and I'll still continue to fight to move people from welfare to work. But I'm here to tell you that that \$20 million will used to secure and keep Sue, so people can go in there and have their pictures made with her and go to receptions. And I also heard that some of it will be used to go out and find some more members of Sue's family. Well, I'm here to tell you that I hope I can get the same support next year that I got this year for the people that are living, living in the State of Illinois, a family of three on \$377. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't want to trivialize any of the

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

concerns of the budget. We all have very similar concerns, believe me. It's not a perfect process, but the Gentleman from Cook used my name in debate. And just for the record, let me make very clear to you, since the Senate would not help protect my dog from the predators that exist out there, I want you to know that as of two hours ago, my wife dropped our dog off at the museum, and Sue's bones are being eaten up as we speak."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig to clo..."

Black: "And secondly... And secondly, to call me a member of the wine and cheese set has certainly elevated me, and I look forward to taking that Gentleman from Cook to some establishments in my district, and when he orders wine and cheese, I'm gonna stand back and watch the fun."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know, I suppose, if each of us had to make up a budget based on the 50 billion or so dollars that the Governor has available and the state has available, we'd come up with 118 different solutions to how to spend that money here in the House. And I daresay that you could find another 59 unique solutions on how to spend that money over in the State Senate. But unfortunately, today as we end the Session, we have to come to agreement on one way to spend that money. Now, we don't have an unlimited supply of money, we all know that and so we have to make some important decisions. And generally what that means is that things that certain Members of the caucus from up north like are in the Bill and certain things that Members from the southern part of the state like are in the Bill somewhere. Our central Illinois Legislators get a piece of the budget, as well. There's a balance that happens, and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

there's things in there that we can look at and say, these are great pieces of the budget and we should do more, and then there's other things we look at and say, what a waste of money, it doesn't affect anyone in my district. But in the end, we have to put together a budget that we can all live with, that makes sense for the State of Illinois as a whole, and it recognizes the priorities that we here in the State of Illinois wish to address. So, no one's trying to say today that this is a perfect budget. It has many of the things that the Governor wishes to have in this budget, and many of the things that we wish to have in this budget. The education increases are the biggest that we've seen in a number of years and I think all of us agree that it's important that we fund education. The dollar an hour increase for our DD community providers are in this budget. Nursing home money is in this budget; that was not in the budget when the Governor introduced it. The 2% cost of doing business is in the budget; that was not in the budget when it was introduced. So, we made some significant changes to the budget, some changes for the best. it's never going to satisfy everyone, but I think there's something of importance in this budget for everyone if you look hard enough. So, I would urge the Members of this Body to accept Senate Amendment #1, that we concur and send this budget on to the Governor for his consideration. think it is a good budget and a step forward. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 4 Members voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Concurrence Motion appears House Bill 263, Representative Novak on Concurrence Motion of Senate Amendment #1 and 2."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 263 that relates to a massive \$800 million expansion for McCormick Place. McCormick Place, the jewel of the Midwest, the diamond of the City of Chicago that needs to compete... needs to maintain its eminence... preeminence in the Midwest to compete with conventions, tourism, that will generate millions of dollars to the state. This proposition simply provides for an \$800 million bonding program that will be financed through a 13-year extension of the sales and use tax to the tourism tax that's currently in place. There is no tax liability to citizens of the State of Illinois. The bond proceeds will be used to finance a 600,000 square foot expansion of McCormick Place bringing to the total McCormick Place exhibition space to 2.8 million square feet. The life... Excuse me. The life of the bonds is between 30 and 40 years. The legislation also redirects \$4.8 million in cigarette tax revenues from the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority to the Statewide Economic Development In addition, it also adopts affirmative action Fund. language, which is designed to increase minority and female

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

contracts. The McCormick Place advisory board restructured, providing for the Mayor, Governor, and Legislative Leaders to each make appointments to the new 12-member board. This project is the largest expansion project to McCormick Place in many years. It will create 21,000 construction jobs. No taxes will be raised in order to create the... to finance the expansion. The economic impact on the State of Illinois will increase from 5.7 billion to \$8.4 billion annually. Tax revenue to the State of Illinois will increase by nearly \$70 million with the McCormick Place expansion. Be more than happy to entertain any questions. I think this is a very, very important Since Boeing is coming to the City of Chicago to relocate their corporate headquarters, McCormick Place needs to compete with cities in the Sunbelt, in the southeastern part of the country, to make sure we maintain our preeminence with conventions and tourism for the City of Chicago and for all the citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I, too, rise in strong support of House Bill 263. I think that this is a critical addition to what is already the preeminent convention and visitor town in the United States. Chicago, as many of you know, does have the largest convention space in the United States. But I think it's important to know that we are not #1 in the number of conventions. At least according to some new data, Las Vegas still has more conventions. Orlando is behind us and moving up. And while we attract many, many visitors because of a great and growing hospitality industry in our state, it is not an industry

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

about which we can be complacent. So, yes, a new addition is on the books and something that I think needs to be done. I will add with some deference to the fact that my constituents, who are not visitors to the State of Illinois but indeed are property taxpayers, do pay a significant portion of that 1% sales tax on food and medicine. But... I'm sorry, on food and drink. But I do know that they understand that it's so critical in terms of the retail industry and the hospitality industry. The hotels in our city are, you know, booming and we're opening more. So, I would urge all of you to support what is indeed the #1 industry in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative Novak, is this simply an extension of the current tax that is in place now?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "And that is a user tax?"

Novak: "Yes, it is."

Parke: "And it's mostly on people who come from out of state to eat food..."

Novak: "Right. It's..."

Parke: " ... and rent hotel rooms?"

Novak: "Visitors to the City of Chicago within a certain delineated specific geographical area that it's a tax on restaurants, hotels, taxi cabs. That funds the bonds."

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Parke: "I also rise in support of this legislation. It is a user tax on those people coming in to utilize 'em. I would like

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

to point out that tourism in this state is one of the major cash cows that generates fresh new tax dollars to the community not only of the City of Chicago, but the whole metropolitan area of Chicago. And it's good for not only Chicago, but it's good for the whole State of Illinois. I think this is a very easy vote. And I would suggest that the Body vote in support of this."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Younge."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Younge: "Would you explain the newly created Statewide Development Fund?"

Novak: "Pardon me, Representative Younge, I couldn't hear you."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Younge: "There is, in the Bill, a newly created Statewide Development Fund."

Novak: "Yes. Well, the \$4.8 million in cigarette tax revenue has always gone to McCormick Place, I think, since way back in the 1970s. What this done... What the Senate Republicans did was they took this \$4.8 million and put it into a Statewide Economic Development Fund. However, under the legislation that we just passed recently under the Budget Implementation Act, there will be an appropriation... a transfer from the General Revenue Fund to the Tourism Fund in the exact amount of... exact... in the same amount of money that will come back to the McCormick Place. The situation is that once the project is completed, I believe in 2007, those tax revenues from the cigarette tax will end at the same time the project is completed. And McCormick Place will no longer receive those \$4.8 million in funds."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Hoffman."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "Representative, real briefly, it's my understanding that there will be... the way this is gonna be funded, there will be no additional taxes that will be imposed, this is simply an extension, is that correct?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "And in addition to that, essentially what we're talking about is the existing tax, we're not talking about the use of any Illinois income tax or any funds generally generated by the state, is that right?"

Novak: "Correct, it's the user..."

Hoffman: "In other words..."

Novak: " ... tax."

Hoffman: " ... we're not taking any money from my district or
 downstate Illinois, sending it to Chicago to help in this
 expansion?"

Novak: "Well, if you and your lovely wife would happen to go to Chicago some night and have a lovely dinner and pay the Bill, you're gonna be paying... you're gonna be help financing those bonds. But no one is gonna be taking any money from any other community in the State of Illinois."

Hoffman: "Well, thank you. And I'm sure my wife would appreciate the compliment. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Hoffman: "As an individual who represents downstate and southwestern Illinois, earlier today, I believe, we talked about coal and ensuring we keep Illinois jobs... Illinois downstate jobs. This is a proposal that will ensure the expansion of McCormick Place and an estimated 21,000 additional jobs... 21,000 new, good, decent-paying jobs for families. This is a proposal that would ensure an economic

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

impact to the State of Illinois. It would increase from 5.7 billion to 8.4 billion annually economic impact because of McCormick Place. Tax revenues for the State of Illinois..."

Speaker Hartke: "Are you concluded, Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Tax revenues for the State of Illinois will increase by nearly 70 million with the McCormick Place expansion. I just say, I ask for a favorable Roll Call. Even though I do represent southwestern Illinois, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Novak to close."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a massive undertaking to promote tourism and convention activities in the City of Chicago, as well as the State of Illinois. Let's make the City of Chicago the premier convention center in the entire country. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 263?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 104 Members voting 'yes', 13 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 263. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Conference Committee Report on Supplemental Calendar #4 appears Senate Bill 629, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we accept Conference Committee #1. This Bill has been

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

worked on for about two years now. It attempts to do two things, which is to deal with the growing problem of animal hoarding and the devastating impact it's had on local shelters and humane care agencies. It also deals with some egregious cases that actually occurred here in Sangamon County with cases of animal cruelty. There's been series of statewide hearings on this. This is truly a statewide problem. And we've worked with numerous groups on this. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion? Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Lawfer: "Representative, will this affect any animals on your farm?"

Dart: "I can honestly tell you, it won't affect one animal on my farm."

Lawfer: "Representative, I understand that it only pertains to dogs, cats, and horses. Is that correct? It does not pertain to any fa... what we would refer to as farm animals?"

Dart: "You are correct, Representative."

Lawfer: "Sounds like a good Bill to me. I plan on supporting it.

Thank you."

Dart: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Dart to close."

Dart: "I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 629?' All those in favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 629. On Supplemental Calendar #6 appears Senate... Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 435, Representative Lindner."

- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt the First

 Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 435. It just
 eliminates a technical Amendment that was filed in the

 House that was in conflict with the bulk of the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 435. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I know we still have some work left to do, but I wanted to take this opportunity to issue my personal thanks to my Members on the Republican side of the aisle and, of course, on the Democrat side of the aisle; we, on this side, would like to thank you for your cooperation during the Session. I think we've had some historic gains this Session: funding the developmentally disabled... DD care workers that we had promised before, we finally met our obligation. Improving nursing homes and meeting conch cost reports, helping on a COLA increase, balancing a

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

budget, putting more money in education than ever before, providing a Circuit Breaker relief for osteoporosis drugs for the best senior citizen prescription drug program in the United States of America barring none, solid, secure promises made, promises kept. I also want to thank our Governor for his relentless support of a great state and for the great budget that we have put forth. And Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this side of the aisle, we're losing a great Member, but only just a few steps away because he'll be joining the Appellate Court tomorrow. And if you would join me in congratulating Representative John Turner on his elevation to the Appellate Court."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Leader Daniels. This is a sad occasion for me to make my last address to the Members of this august Body. I'll keep my remarks very short. I know everyone wants to get to Skip's party. It's been a real privilege and honor for me to have the opportunity to serve with all you, so many outstanding individuals from all over the State of Illinois. helped me grow as a person, I've learned a lot from all of you. You've opened my eyes and my heart in ways that would have never been possible but for the opportunity to serve with so many outstanding people. And Leader Daniels, you've always been great to me. You've assisted me when I came into the House, and you've assisted me even as I leave And to Speaker Madigan, as well, if you're listening. I'd heard that you're a pretty tough customer when I got here. And you are. But I don't mean that in disparagingly. You've always treated me professionally and with courtesy. And I appreciate that. I can tell you that

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

I will miss you all very dearly. The Appellate Court building is just across the street. I hope that you will come and visit me. If you don't, I can assure you that I will come and visit you. And wherever my life takes me from here, however many days I have left, I can tell you that I will always look back upon my days in the House of Representatives as some of the happiest and most exciting days in my life. It's been a great, great ride. I thank all of you. God bless you."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Turner. The Chair recognizes Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We... Those of us on this side of the aisle with the little people, we just want to say good-bye to Shaun Moore, one of our staffers in the Department of Human Service Appropriation. Shaun will be going to law school in Arizona and then come back and work for Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Hartke: "Congratulations. Leader Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also want to take this opportunity on behalf of all House Republicans to thank our staff. We happen to be a little prejudiced on this side of the aisle and think we have the best staff in Springfield. And we say that with great pride. To our Chief of Staff, Mike Tristano; our Director of Research, Scott Reimers; our Director of Appropriations, Kent Gaffney; our Deputy Chief of Staff, Laura Anderson, and others, we want to thank them for their great service to all of us here in Springfield. Also, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to thank Speaker Mike Madigan for his help and assistance this Session and congratulate all of you and wish everyone in the chamber, staffs on both sides, a very, very well-earned summer vacation. So, thank you, Sir, for

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

your help. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black, your name was not mentioned."

Black: "I'm sorry, what?"

Speaker Hartke: "Your name was not mentioned."

Black: "I have the proxy vote now for Representative Turner."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay."

Black: "In 35 minutes. Let me just echo what Leader Daniels said about staff. And it's true on both sides of the aisle. You make this job bearable, you make this job livable, and you generally... when you have to deal with us day in and day out, I'm always amazed at your resilience and your sense of humor. A special note, however, I'm up on suite with Representative Wojcik Representative Lindner. We're on the sixth floor, most of you have never been up there because you can't find our office, which isn't bad on some lobby days. But we share the sixth floor not only with the House Republican Press Office, but with Speaker Madigan's Technical Review Staff. And let me just say that those of you who serve on that Technical Review Staff and who live with us on the sixth floor, your sense of humor, your willingness to put up with our sense of humor, my sense of humor, my silly string, my squirt gun, my dart gun, and my ping-pong ball gun, you make life bearable after long hours of stress and tension and disappointment. Nobody likes to lose in this business, none of us do, we didn't come down here to lose. But it's always pleasant to be able to go to the sixth floor, not only to deal with our Press Office, who are always an upbeat group of young people, but a Technical Review Staff that Speaker Madigan and your Chief of Staff, Tim Mapes, works very hard. But you are a de..."

69th Legislative Day May 31, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black, your time has expired."

Black: "Well, some things never change around here, Mr. Speaker.

But anyway, my hat is off to your Technical Review Staff,

they have been a delight to work with up on the sixth

floor."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Novak. Representative Novak,

House Resolution 405. Supplemental Calendar #5."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate the Chair willing to call this Resolution. It is important. It is a supplement to the historic coal and gas legislation that we passed earlier this evening. What it does is require the United States... it urges the United States EPA to reconsider and review its NOx SIP Call Emissions Trading Credits Program that will go into effect in 2004 in Illinois. It also asked that the Illinois EPA review the program to make sure that there are enough emissions trading credits so when new generation comes to Illinois, they will be able to operate during the ozone period which is from May to September. It's a very important Resolution. We need to get this passed so we can provide information to any type of financing mechanisms out there that want to be able to finance new generation in the state. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall... Representative Slone."

Slone: "Sorry. I rise in opposition, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I will be short, I promise. We should be trying to deal with the issue of how many NOx emission credits we have by reducing

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

some of the NOx emissions from existing sources as these new sources come online. And I would urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 405?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 405, there were 93 Members voting 'yes', 16 Members voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 405. Joint Resolution House 41. Representative Novak. Mr. Novak. Yes, order of Novak. Not his."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. House Joint Resolution 41 simply names a number of highways and the state routes to honor certain individuals. I think everybody has a copy of it. It... In my home district, it renames Illinois Route 50 to a memorial highway for our deceased Mayor Kenneth Hayes, who brought millions of dollars of economic development into my district. It renames 70... Interstate 72, I believe, for the veterans... excuse me, not the veterans but the..."

Speaker Hartke: "Purple Heart."

Novak: " ... Purple Heart Memorial Veterans Highway. It also renames, I think it's Interstate 39 that goes through Rockford, the Zeke Giorgi Memorial Highway. I'd be more than happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 41?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Joint Resolution 41, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 41. House Resolution 428, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is...
this Resolution is a counterpoint... counterpart to the
coal Bill, the other energy Bill we just did. This has
to... air quality Bill. This has to do with setting up a
special subcommittee on energy efficiency and renewable
energy resources development as part of our E & E
Committee. This would work at this summer and this fall,
looking at a variety of energy efficiency issues that we
could maybe take up next year and we hope to. And I ask
for your favorable support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 428?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 428. House Resolution 348, Representative Poe. Supplemental Calendar #2."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. This is a... recognizes the Captain Joseph Bowman's Company Regiment in 1778 as the official Revolutionary War Re-enactment Unit for the State of Illinois. They go all over the United States representing Illinois and through southern Illinois. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Resolution 348?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 350, Representative Kosel. Representative Kosel."

- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask for the adoption of Resolution to set up a Legislative Oversight Committee for Project Success that would... And would ask for your approval of this Resolution."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Kosel, would you like to adopt the Amendment?"
- Kosel: "I'm sorry, yes. We need to adopt the Amendment first."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor

 Amendment #1 to House Resolution 350?' All those in favor

 signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

 the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is

 adopted. Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Yes, I would ask the approval of the Resolution. As I stated before, Project Success Oversight Committee from... formed of House Members and administrators from the executive branch and one of the administrators from Project Success."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House... House Resolution 350?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 350. House Resolution 365, Representative Winkel on the Resolution."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 365 urges the Department of Natural Resources to conduct a study of the groundwater and aquifer system of Illinois. I'd appreciate its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 365?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 365. House Resolution 370, Representative Stroger. Representative Stroger. Out of the record. House Resolution 372, Representative Winkel."
- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 372 urges public awareness of safety in construction zones. And I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 372?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 372. House Resolution 370, Representative Stroger."
- Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 370 declares

 June 15th through June 23rd as Immigrant Worker Justice

 Week."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 370 (sic-House Resolution 370)?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

The vote... saying 'aye'; those opposed... voting 'aye', voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 370, 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 person voting 'present'. And the House adopts House Resolution 370. House Resolution 385, Representative Moffitt."

- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 385 urges that the President of the United States, the United States Congress, to promote the production and the use of ethanol and biodiesel by providing these fuels a prominent place in the national energy policy. And I'd urge its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 385?' All those in favor will vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and O voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 385. House Resolution 387, Representative Zickus."
- Zickus: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 387 asks the State Board of Education and the Capital Development Board to look into cost overruns, construction delays, bidding process, superintendent retirement benefit package, school-related consulting firm..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 387?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Amendment is adopted. Now, the Resolution. All those in favor of the Resolution signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 387. House Resolution 388, Representative Soto. Representative Soto. Delgado. Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 388 is the Peoples Gas (sic-Energy) Resolution urging that there be resolution to the Peoples Gas (sic-Energy) strike in the City of Chicago and that everybody come together on this to make sure that families in the City of Chicago and consumers do not continue to have to deal with this issue."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Voice vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke. All those in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 390, Representative Hamos. Out of the record. House Resolution 399, Representative Younge. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 399, Amendment #1 would change the number of people on the task force to ten and the reporting date would be April 30, 2002. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Resolution 399?

Representative Morrow. Excuse me, Moore. Would you like to adopt the Amendment first? Representative Moore on the Amendment."

Moore: "I would have to ask the Representative if she fulfilled the obligations that she promised to committee as far as changing the Members."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes. I just described that it was changed to ten and

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

the reporting date was added. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Moore: "And so, the Members are equal between the Republicans and Democrats?"

Younge: "Yes. Yes, that's correct."

Moore: "Thank you very much."

Younge: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 399?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Now, on the Resolution."

Younge: "On the Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 399?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 399, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 403, Representative Delgado on the Resolution."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 403 urges that Congress pass legislation reforming the Freedom to Farm Law and the sugar price support program to correct inequities contained in them."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 403?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 46, Representative Coulson."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Coulson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adopt Amendment #1 and #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you explain those? Would you explain those Amendments."

Coulson: "Yes, I can. Amendment #1..."

- Speaker Hartke: "They're Committee Amendments, have already been adopted. On the Resolution."
- Coulson: "Okay. On the Resolution. Establishes an Early Intervention Legislative Advisory Committee and sets up that it's the same as the Advisory Committee in 461, which we passed over to the Senate. Basically, it requires some reporting. And I'd urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 46?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Joint Resolution 46, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 46. House... Senate Joint Resolution 6, Representative Stephens-Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 6 simply urges the state agencies, school districts, interested organizations, and groups, and individuals to fly the flag at half-mast... the United States flag at half-mast on December 7th in honor of the men and women who died as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Joint Resolution 6?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 26, Representative Ryder."

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would continue the suspensions of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules as it matters in the Corey H. matter. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 26?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Tenhouse, would you like to vote on that issue? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 26. Senate Joint Resolution 29, Representative Black. Is there a medic in the House?"

Black: "I get so excited. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That really hurt."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Senate Joint Resolution 29 encourages the Department of
Natural Resources to develop the recently acquired Perry
County area for horseback and dog field trials. I urge an
'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Is there a medic in the House? Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 29?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 29. House

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Resolution 427, Representative Feigenholtz."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll make this quick because hope springs eternal and everyone wants to be able to sleep when they go home. This Resolution urges the Department of Public Aid to seek a waiver from the Health Care Finance Administration for approval of federal matching funds for FamilyCare so that when we find the money the waiver will be in place. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 427?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 44, Representative Wirsing."
- Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 44 urges the formation of the Food Animal Institute to study food animal industry here in the state. It's to keep the issue alive that... the legislation is in the Senate."
- Speaker Hartke: "Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Joint Resolution 44, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 329, offered by Speaker Madigan;
 House Resolution 397, offered by Representative O'Brien;
 House Resolution 400, offered by Representative Black;
 House Resolution 401, offered by Representative Black;
 House Resolution 402, offered by Representative Currie;
 House Resolution 404, offered by Representative Erwin;
 House Resolution 406, offered by Representative Bill
 Mitchell; House Resolution 407, offered by Representative

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

Coulson; House Resolution 408, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie; House Resolution 409, offered by Representative Durkin; House Resolution 410, offered by Representative Lou Jones; House Resolution 411, offered by Representative Brady; House Resolution 412, offered by Representative Flowers; House Resolution 413, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Resolution 414, offered by Representative Meyer; House Resolution 415, offered by Representative Scully; House Resolution 416, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell; House Resolution 418, offered by Representative Dart; House Resolution 419, offered by Representative Dart; House Resolution 420, offered by Representative Howard; House Resolution 421, offered by Representative Mendoza; House Resolution 422, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 423, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 424, offered by Representative Feigenholtz; House Resolution 425, offered by Representative Daniels; House Resolution 426, offered by Representative Joseph Lyons; House Resolution 429, offered by Representative Osmond; House Resolution 430, offered by Representative Ryan; House Resolution 431, offered by Representative Younge; House Resolution 433, offered by Representative Monique Davis; House Resolution 435, offered Representative O'Brien; and House Resolution 436, offered by Representative Lou Jones."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #41 offered by Representative Currie.

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, May 31, 2001, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 7, 2001, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when the House of Representatives stands adjourned, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 7, 2001, in Perfunctory Session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 13, 2001, at 1:00 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to adjourn. Some of you may have additional Resolutions that you want to have considered. We must advise you that the Adjournment Resolution, which has already been adopted by the Senate, provides that we shall adjourn today. So, we have about eight minutes of time left for business. I would like to make a few closing remarks and present a Death Resolution for a former Member who was a running mate of mine. So, I think that if there are some of you who really feel that you have to have a Resolution called, you should raise your hand now and we'll do it, but we only have seven or eight minutes."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Righter."

Righter: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 42, I'd ask that it

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

be called."

Speaker Hartke: "Place the Bill."

Righter: "It's been on the Calendar for three days."

Speaker Hartke: "House Joint Resolution 42. Representative Righter moves the adoption of House Joint Resolution... All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Speaker Madigan. Wyvetter Younge, your Joint Resolution... or Resolution."

Younge: "House Resolution 122. If the Body would agree that this could be an Agreed Resolution, I'd appreciate it. It urges IHDA to do a study for the mentally ill who are homeless. IHDA's lobbyist has agreed to the Resolution and there is no disagreement about it. And it calls for a study, a plan in reference to the homeless mentally ill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Younge moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House... Amendment #2 to House Resolution 122. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted to the Resolution. On the House Resolution 122, all those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 122, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House Resolution is adopted. Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Let me just thank all of the Members for their outstanding work during a very productive Session, so we all would end a great deal of time and effort in considering thousands of Bills and numerous issues. This Session will be recorded as a successful Session because we successfully addressed

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

several major issues affecting the State of Illinois and its people. Representative Daniels has already thanked the Republican staff. I want to thank and acknowledge the Democratic staff. They have done an outstanding job of servicing the Democratic Members. And in conclusion, just thank you for everything you've done. Have a wonderful, wonderful summer. And Mr. Speaker, if you could call that Death Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "One thing first. All those in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 41 signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 329, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 329, offered by Speaker Madigan.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 329

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives wish to express their sincere condolences to the family and friends of former Illinois State Senator Frank Savickas, who passed away on May 14, 2001; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank Savickas was the first member of Lithuanian extraction to be elected to the Illinois House of Representatives where he served from 1967 through 1971 and the Senate where he served from 1971 through 1992; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank Savickas grew up on the Southwest Side of Chicago in a heavily Lithuanian community; he attended Wilson College and once ran for the United States Congress in the early 1980s; he also served as a Merchant Marine; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank Savickas rose through the ranks to become chairman of the Senate Labor Committee and as assistant

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

majority leader; he was also a committeeman in Chicago's 15th

Ward; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank Savickas was also appointed by Mayor Richard M. Daley to a leadership position at Midway Airport; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank Savickas was known in the House and Senate as a champion of the causes of senior citizens and the handicapped and disabled; Senator Savickas is considered the father of the legislation which gave the disabled the right to be educated; and

WHEREAS, In addition, Senator Frank Savickas was known as a champion for the working class and was the primary sponsor of legislation that increased criminal penalties for crimes against the elderly in the mid 1980s; and

WHEREAS, The passing of Senator Frank Savickas will be deeply felt by all who knew and loved him, especially his wife, Pam; his children, Michael, Linda, Sharon, Margaret, Angela, and Bianca; and his many friends and colleagues in the Illinois General Assembly; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with all who knew him, the death of former State Senator Frank Savickas of Venice, Florida; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of former State Senator Frank Savickas with our sincere condolences."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frank Savickas was my predecessor here in the House. He sat right down in the second aisle. He was elected to the House in 1966, elected to the Senate in

69th Legislative Day

May 31, 2001

1970, which was the first election when I was elected to the House. We grew up politically in the 13th Ward of the City of Chicago as members of that ward organization. We were very, very good friends, spent a great deal of time together both governmentally, politically, and socially. Those were in my younger years here in Springfield. was a guy from the neighborhood. He was not terribly well-educated, he was not the most articulate Member of the Legislature, but he understood that he had been sent to the Legislature by working men and women from the southwest side of Chicago and he understood that their interests and concerns were very basic. And that's why he came to the Legislature to represent those interests to the very best of his ability. In listening to the Resolution, you know that he served here for over 20 years. And so, in terms of gauge of political success, he was very, very successful. As I said, he was my very good friend and a very, very good person who died just too young, too, too young. So, on behalf of all the Members of the House, I wish to express our regret to his wife, Pam, and to the six children, and to wish them the best. And I vote for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "All those in favor of the Resolution adoption signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Currie now moves that the House, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, stand adjourned until the hour of 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 11... excuse me, November 13, 2001. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."