64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask you to turn off your cell phones, your computers, your pagers. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most sovereign King, who art the ruling and reigning authority, we come before You humbly, asking for Your guidance. For it is Your word that has instructed us that we are to lean not toward our own understanding, but as rather in all of our ways we are to acknowledge You and that You will direct our paths. So Father, it is our prayer today for this Your people is that You will order our steps, for it is the steps of a righteous people, it is those that are ordered by the Lord. This we kindly pray and ask in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hamos."
- Hamos 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 Feigenholtz is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bost."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 117

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk. Chair recognizes Mr. Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. As we said yesterday, we're gonna do a caucus, Room 118, the Republicans. We'll be as quick as possible."
- Speaker Madigan: "All right. The Republicans plan to go to caucus immediately and we shall plan on returning to the floor at about 9:30. Republican Caucus. Republicans, please take Mr. Black with you. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk, what've you got? On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, page 8 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 472. Mr. Cross. Mr. Clerk, have you read the Bill for a third time?"

Clerk Rossi: "The Bill has not been read for a third time." Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 472, a Bill for an Act relating to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that we talked about somewhat yesterday and again I reiterate my appreciation of all of the work that so many people have done, including Representative O'Brien and Senator Cullerton. This is the… Senate Bill 472 is a death penalty reform Bill. As I mentioned earlier in or yesterday in

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

explaining the Amendment which became the Bill, it does retain all 20 of the eliqibility factors in the current law with respect to those eligible for the death penalty. There is language in here dealing with lineup procedures, the issue of discovery is covered in this Bill in that all information available to the police needs to prosecutors who in turn need to turn it over to the defense. The issue of the Supreme Court case dealing with mental retardation and those eligible or I should say not eligible for the death penalties are handled in this particular Bill and Amendment. The issue of informant reliability or their testimony is handled in this Bill, as well as the addition of the issue of witness inducements need to be reported to the defense. It is a Bill that everybody has spent, as I said, a great deal of time on. I think it's a good Bill. It's something we need to do in the State of Illinois. We probably should've done it earlier, but the reality is we didn't and we've done it now. It's a good Bill and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Brosnahan: "Tom, I had a couple questions. If you could kind of maybe walk me through it a little bit, the issue of mental retardation and eligibility. The time when that can be raised, whether it would be a pre-trial determination

64th Legislative Day

- and if a pre-trial determination isn't made, what are the options at that point? When could they raise that again?"
- Cross: "Jimmy, if you can raise it at... and thanks... you raise it at a pre-trial stage as opposed to a trial stage. I don't know if you were asking that particular question."
- Brosnahan: "I guess my question is, if that issue is not raised in a pre-trial motion is that issue then waived or can they bring it up again then when the... when the actual guilt-innocence phase of the trial is over? Can they bring it up at that point?"
- Cross: "There's also... and you know this probably even better than I do, Jim. I'm told you can raise it not only in the pre-trial stage but also when there's the decision of whether... at the eligibility phase of the death penalty... of a death penalty case, you can raise it at that time as well. So, I guess you have two different times you can raise it."
- Brosnahan: "And I'm assuming now for the pre-trial determination, that would be done just by a... by a judge, there's not a jury... that's not an option at that point. Correct?"
- Cross: "That is... at that stage it is... it is just by the judge, Jim."
- Brosnahan: "Okay. And then if a judge rules that the person is not mentally retarded and it goes to trial, the person is found guilty. At that point, does the defendant have the opportunity to raise the issue of mental retardation again?"

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Cross: "Aga... The answer is 'yes' at that... at the eligibility phase. You're right."

Brosnahan: "Now, at that point of the eligibility phase does the defendant have the ability to have that issue heard again in front of the judge or then do you have the option to ask for a jury?"

Cross: "Both."

Brosnahan: "Both. Okay."

Cross: "Both the judge and a jury."

Brosnahan: "Okay. In... and I... the one concern I had, Tom, and I do think it's for the most part a very good piece of legislation, but I... I noticed... and there were... they're all different versions of this Bill going back for a couple years on the issue of mental retardation. But I've talked to many people that thought that it wasn't appropriate to put an exact number in there for the IQ of the person, because there's so many different factors that affect a person's IQ. In this legislation there is an IQ of 75. Is that correct? That determines..."

Cross: "Jim, and I... you raise a good question. I don't know if you have the Amendment, but on page 20 it... and I think it's worth reading, 'an intelligence quotation 75 or below is presumptive evidence of mental retardation.' So, obviously, there's more that can go into it other than just the specific... that number if you will."

Brosnahan: "Okay. And I guess my concern is with the number and I just hope people are aware of it is, a lot of the experts say that there is a range of five points, basically

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

a... an error of five points. And so a lot of people were saying it should be 70 and then if the error is five points then, ya know, 75 would be presumpted to be a... would be a presumption of mental retardation. I think when you put the 75 in there a concern of many people is all of a sudden if you're using that five point error that now the number of 80 is gonna be presumpted of mental retardation and that seems to be the highest IQ of any state that... that... that has this in their law."

Cross: "It... I... apparently, a lot of discussion went in as to this number, Jim, and, ya know, your point about 70, 75, apparently somewhere they had to come up with a number and 75 ended up being agreed. But I guess I would just point out the other factors that all go into... that would go into the issue as to the determination if someone's mentally retarded and I think you've seen those and you know what those are. I... I think you make some valid points on the 75, but if someone... you had to be somewhere is all I..."

Brosnahan: "Okay."

Cross: "...is all I could say."

Brosnahan: "All right. Thank you, Tom."

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? 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. Joyce. Mr. Joyce, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 10.

64th Legislative Day

- Do you wish to move the Bill? Gentleman indicates he does not wish to move the Bill. Mr. Reitz, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 46. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 46, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Franks. Mr. Franks on Senate Bill 75. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 75, a Bill for an Act concerning the courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Pihos. Pihos on Senate 130. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 130, a Bill for an Act concerning the Children's Health Insurance Program. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Pihos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pihos on the Amendment."
- Pihos: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 130 becomes the Bill. It deletes the repeal date of the Children's Health Insurance Program Act, KidCare, which was currently set to repeal on July 1, 2003.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

And it amends the Children's Health Insurance Program Act to provide eligibility at the 200 percent of the federal poverty level. And also provides for eligibility for the FamilyCare Program to be set at a level as determined by the Department of Public Aid by rule and the rule shall not specify a level lower than 90 percent. We've seen tremendous success in out KidCare Program and in his State of State Address, Governor Blagojevich, said he would ask for the 20 thousand additional slots. And this Body passed House Bill 3766 already which provides the funding for both of these programs. ...favorable vote. Are there any questions?"

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

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. For what purpose does Mr. Dunkin seek recognition?"

Dunkin: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Dunkin: "I would like for the Members of the chamber to wish Representative Michael Smith a happy birthday."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 46?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 46 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 947?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 947, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Osterman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osterman on the Amendment."
- Osterman: "I'd just like to keep that Bill on Second Reading for purposes of a fourth Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"
- Clerk Rossi: "The Bill has been read a second time today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 2671. Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2671 is the budget for higher education. Many of you, I hope can recall just a few days ago when we sent most of the budgets to the Senate for their consideration. The Senate has since acted and has sent back these Bills for our consideration. And I would ask for your help in concurring in these budgets. In this Bill, House Bill 2671, the Senate has included Chicago State University, Eastern Illinois University, Governors State, the higher ed budget, Illinois Community College Board, Illinois State University, Northeastern Illinois, Northern Illinois,

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Southern Illinois, State University Civil Service System, University of Illinois and Western Illinois. On many of these universities the Senate has brought the schools back to the Governor's recommended introduced levels, in other cases they've made some changes. I'd be... let me... let me highlight a few of the changes before I ask... answer questions. There has been an increase at Chicago State in recognition of the fact that they have a library that's being opened and that they need to... and they need to man that building. There are some changes as well at the State Board... I'm sorry, at the Board of Higher Education. Advance Proton Source X-Ray Collaboration for Illinois technology, an item that was discussed in committee and not included is... is there. There's some additional money for workforce. There's some money for the community colleges to address some of the problems that they face with the formula in particular. And there's some additional funding or recognition that at Southern Illinois University that we restore monies to reflect the exemption of the SIU School of Medicine Direct Payments Care Services Program. those are the... those are the main changes that were made by the Senate and I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding the Senate action. I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Giles: "Representative Hannig, I know this is the Senate version, but I have a question dealing with the Student Assistance Commission, dealing with the MAP program once again. There's still some debate and some controversy over the fifth year MAP. I know this program has been partially restored at a... I believe it is at \$12 million."

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, we've put some additional money into the MAP program. We have a... a... we have a agency whose purpose it is to distribute that money. I've got a statement here, Representative, shortly I'd like to read into the record to try to clarify that."

Giles: "Mr. Speaker, I can't ... I can't hear the response."

Hannig: "Representative, just let me state for the record that it's the intent of the Legislature to use the additional 12 million to restore awards for students in their fifth year of eligibility for the Monetary Award Program. So, it's a very broad... it's a very broad use of the money."

Giles: "So, we restored this program to 12 million and this can be used to any student that... in their fifth year of that university."

Hanniq: "Yes."

Giles: "Any student, it's not limited towards a specific
 program or..."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Giles: "...for individual?"

Hanniq: "You are correct."

Giles: "And how much was the program originally?"

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, the Governor's introduced level was zero..."

Giles: "Okay."

Hannig: "...for the fifth year. We restored it to 12 million here in the House and..."

Giles: "And..."

Hannig: "...the Senate retained that Amendment."

Giles: "And Representative, you may not know this, but could you or maybe someone around you currently, how did we come up with the number 12 million? And the reason I ask that question because this is a very important program and 12 million being restored which is fine and good, I know the Governor had zero at his level, but we're talking about 12 million being restored to all of the fifth-year students and I just can't see how that's going to be enough. This... it's... this program is gonna run out since we have such of a broad categor... category of students that can apply, that it would be applicable to right now."

Hannig: "Representative, if I could answer that question. The 12 million was actually the recommend... recommended level from the Board of Higher Education. When the Governor actually introduced the budget it was zero, we brought it back to their recommended level. It could be that you're correct that it isn't enough, but that's what the state or the Board of Higher Education believes the correct amount is."

Giles: "Thank you. And did you get a number as to what it was originally? Did you give me that number?"

64th Legislative Day

- Hannig: "The Board of Higher... I'll give you the... the... what happened. The Board of Higher Education thought it... Yeah, the thought was that we think that it would cost about 20 million to totally restore the fifth year. So, I think you're correct in the sense that the 12 may not be enough, Representative, but the board recommended 12, the Governor put it in at zero and we restored it to 12 in Representative Slone's committee and the Senate has concurred with that Amendment or that is they have not deleted that Amendment. So, that's where we are today."
- Giles: "Tell me this, Representative, to the best of your ability other than adding the 12 million back to that specific program, what is the overall additional... the amount of the additional funding in the higher education budget?"
- Hannig: "The total from all systems from all schools, is that what you wish, Representative?"
- Giles: "That's correct."
- Hannig: "Is about \$25 million over the Governor's introduced level, on the GRF side."
- Giles: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. Ya know, once again, I think this is probably one of the most profound programs in the higher education, the MAP program, that help with students who have various hardships and stu... there's numerous of students that would not have had the opportunity to go to school, to go to get a higher education to get a college degree. And I think this is such a vital program and I think it should be restored at

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

its original level. This is one of these programs I truly believe that we could find the resource that we could cut other places and to make sure that this program is stored (Sic-restored) at its original level. And for that reason I think I will have to do 'present' vote on this piece of legisla... on this... on this particular budget at this particular time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Myers."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Myers: "Representative Hannig, one of the major differences between this Bill with the Senate Amendments and what we passed out of here is the reduction to the state universities of approximately \$10 million. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, the Governor introduced his budget for higher education, the committee that I believe you serve on with Representative Slone felt it was important to provide for an additional \$10 million above the Governor's level in spite of the fact that the universities themselves have said they support the Governor's level. We passed it at that higher level. The Senate has stripped most of that money... all of that money off from the universities."

Myers: "Okay. On that basis, if all of the universities basically said they would support the Governor's level, then why did we put 1... almost \$1.6 million back into Chicago State?"

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Hannig: "Representative, I think we recognized the fact that under the Capitol Program that's been advanced in the last few years that... that we... that we build a library and now we've come to a time where they need to move the books back and they need to in part have people there to run that library. So, that's one of the major things that we understand that the Governor missed and so the Senate included it and I think that it's appropriate."

Myers: "Well, Representative Hannig, there are other universities that had similar things in their operating budget that were items of necessity that have been pulled out as a result of reduction of that 10 million that was addition... added in, in addition to the original cut that was implemented in the Governor's proposed budget. But getting back to that specific item, it's been called to my attention that a number of years ago the faculty and the students at Eastern Illinois University did that on a voluntary basis, they didn't require a funding of close to a million dollars to do that."

Hannig: "Representative, the other point I would make about Chicago State and I think we all have to recognize, ya know, I went to the University of Illinois, about twice a year they're calling me up asking me to donate money to them and I do. They've got a great endowment. Some of our smaller schools and this is one of the smallest and has one of the smallest endowments, they simply don't have the money to go into an endowment plan and take money for, ya know, for their use of operations. There's a lot of

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

social, economically difficult students who go there and it's... we have to make sure that we provide for their education. So, ya know, we have to recognize the special needs of some of the schools that... that are here in the State of Illinois and I think this is one of them."

Myers: "Representative Hannig, I don't disagree with you on that... on that point, I have been to Chicago State University, I recognize the locality that it's in and I think it's a very credible university and provides a very important function in that community and is one... just part our overall higher education system that is outstanding system in the United States. One year we were rated number one on the report card, the next... two years later we were rated number three. So, that being said, I don't begrudge necessarily Chicago State getting more, what we do have a problem with is the fact that they were given special treatment over all of the other universities in the state that help support that entire higher education system. I think Chicago State is very worthy of money that they receive within any budget that we pass out of here in the state... in the General Assembly, but so are the other state university systems. Chicago State at the present time has the highest GRF per student of any state university within the system. There's another university in the Chicago area that's a two-year university that also has a special student population that could be argued that it... it also serves a special function and a special need and could very easily require additional funding for that

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

purpose. But I think when we're looking at system within Illinois, traditionally, all State of universities have been treated pretty much the same in terms of the way the funding has been allocated to them and in the way the cuts have been made and this just seems to be counter to... to that traditional method. question that I have is in regards to additions to the Board of Higher Education in the amount of 3.7 million. Now, as we passed a piece of legislation out of here earlier we acknowledged that the 2.1 million for the Advanced Photon Source Projection at Argonne National Laboratory in conjunction with Northwestern University needed to be in there. And that is in this particular piece of legislation or in the Amendment that was sent over by the Senate, but there was additional 1.6 million appropriated for the HECA Grant Program. Is that something that was initiated or talked about on the House side or is that just something that the Senate decided that they needed to add into the program?"

Hannig: "Representative, the... the Advanced Photon Source, I think, was something that was talked about on the House side. The Amendment..."

Myers: "Yes."

Hannig: "for whatever reason didn't get on and so the Senate picked it up. The... the other items you talked about were as a result of discussions primarily in the Senate Higher Education Committee."

64th Legislative Day

- Myers: "Okay. Two more questions, Representative Hannig.

 Under the community college line items is the \$12 million

 for the technology line that was transferred to CMS, is

 that still out of this budget? Is it still over in the CMS

 budget?"
- Hannig: "The State Board's money came back, but the Higher... the Board of Higher Ed is still at CMS, Representative."
- Myers: "Okay. And one other questions regarding the financial assistance to the private colleges and universities of the State of Illinois, I believe it was a little over \$20 million. Is that still eliminated from this Amendment?"
- Hannig: "I think there was no... no change in the House when we passed the Bill to address that and there was no change in the Senate proposal to address that, Representative."
- Myers: "Could you give a little bit more background about the 7 million for the 'hold harmless' for the community colleges, please? Do you have any idea how much of that's gonna go to the city colleges as compared to the downstate community colleges?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, just like what we have at the K through 12 level we have formulas that we have in place and sometimes they work very well and sometimes things change and we find that some schools are put at a disadvantage. We often come in with a 'hold harmless' for downstate schools at K through 12 or we talk about things as transitional money. This is the same kind of effort to 'hold harmless' some of the schools in our system that have found themselves significantly impacted in an adverse way

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

because of the way that the formula works in this particular time, so... Yeah, so, I... the Illinois Community College Board is a part of this agreement. This is not something that the Senate just, ya know, invented on their own or thought up on their own. This is between the Illinois Community College Board and the city colleges and this was an agreement and this Amendment implements that agreement."

Myers: "Gary, has the..."

Hannig: "And... and it..."

Myers: "...the Community College Board provided you with a breakdown of what the city colleges are gonna get out of this 'hold harmless' versus the downstate community colleges?"

Hannig: "So, we think about 5 million roughly will go to the city colleges and 2 to other community colleges around the state."

Myers: "Does that correspond to their percentage level of the overall budget within the community college system?"

Hannig: "Yeah. The... if you look at the adult ed portion and that's the portion that the city colleges are adversely impacted by, they provide something like 40 percent of the overall cost or they spend 40 percent of the monies in this area in community colleges. And so that's why they have a large part of the reimbursement under the 'hold harmless'. But again, it was a formula that was negotiated between the Community College Board and the colleges, so... so I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Myers: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers, could you bring your remarks to a

close."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm done."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I just have one question and I've asked several people and I've never really gotten any kind of a rationale for the transfer of the Advance Technology Grant which was about 12 million for community colleges. It's always been administered by the Community College Board. I'm not aware of any audit finding, in fact, I think they've done an excellent job and for some reason it's... it was transferred to CMS and now it shows up in the CMS budget as 7 million instead of the 12 million. I... What rationale was there to trans... I've asked that it be transferred back, which would be no new money and I just don't... I just don't get an answer."

Hannig: "Well, I think, Representative, we know that Central Management Services is the agency that deals with computer and software purchases and aquisitions and... for the state and it seemed like, I believe, in the Governor's view that this would fold into what they do over at CMS. Now, we had an opportunity here in the House to make that transfer back and it was the view, I believe, of the committee not to do

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

that and the same view in the Senate not to do that. So, this is why we're... this is where we are today."

Black: "All right. Well, my only fear is that that grant, I know from personal experience, is well used to keep community colleges on the cutting edge where many people who are transitioning from the old industrial model to the new high-tech model, many of them go to community colleges where they learn to operate computer-assisted design and manufacturing machines, where they learn how to deal with computers in the workplace. My fear is that CMS will take some of this money as administrative expense and that... that state-of-the-art computer technology program that the community colleges have will begin to deteriorate. maybe I'm concerned over something that may not happen, but it remains a legitimate concern. I want you to know that I tried to get that in there, was not successful and that is, I think everything else has been covered but I did want to put my concern about that grant on the record."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wirsing. Mr. Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just had a question and a comment. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Spon..."

Wirsing: "Will the Sponsor yield? Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Wirsing: "Representative, I'm... I wanted to speak on this legislation for two reasons. One is, as my initial persp... involvement in higher education as a Legislator has been developed from a statewide perspective, not to say that I

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

don't carry water for Northern Illinois University at times, but it's always very clear when I am doing that. As I looked at this budget as it's come back and from... once again, from a nine-public university system, concern me that one of those university systems has come out a winner in a year when the other universities have had to take being not a winner, being on the negative side of the cuts. This... and I need to raise this issue relative to Chicago State. I like Chicago State and all that, but I need to raise this issue because it is of great concern to me when we look at our public university system here in Illinois. This is decisive... or this does not make sense to select one university out and put dollars into that university when all the other universities are bottom line ending up in cuts. And I know you've responded to this in some perspective, but if you could respond to me from that arena, looking at it from a statewide system, a very, very good system, we know that."

Hanniq: "Right."

Wirsing: "And if you could respond to me to help me understand the logic behind this."

Hannig: "Representative, we all understand, for example, at the K through 12, at the high school and grade school level, that it costs different amounts of money to educate students for any variety of reasons. So, when you look at the higher education community, I think it's also fair to say that it costs more to educate people for a variety of reasons. Chicago State happens to be in a more densely

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

populated part of the state where oftentimes all costs are simply higher than what we find in the downstate areas. They happen to primarily address a group of young people who are seeking an education who come from the poorest communities around our state and simply cannot stand to take a increase in their tuition, these youngsters would oftentimes simply fall out of the system. And so... and also the school, as I said earlier, simply doesn't have the kind of endowment that we have at the University of Illinois or some of the bigger schools, who have for a long time been able to raise significant kinds of money there that they can fall back on in hard times like this. So, we have to, I think, recognize the uniqueness that we have with Chicago State, recognize the people they're trying to educate. For many of these people if we can keep 'em in school, if we can get 'em an education, it's a difference between becoming a successful taxpayer or a burden on the State of Illinois and clearly we wanna... we wanna see those folks succeed. So, I think we just have to recognize the special significance of this school. And like I said, I went to the University of Illinois, it's my, ya know, my alma mater. I'd love to say we could put a whole bunch of money into the university. I'm close to Southern Illinois in Edwardsville. It's near my district. I'd like to see that community... that college grow as well, but I think we have to recognize the uniqueness of Chicago State."

Wirsing: "Well, I... the base of my concern, once again, looking at the system as a total, we've got Northeastern

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

University, we've got Governors State University, which are in the same parameters from a size… if you look at the size of those systems in comparison. And looking at it from a statewide perspective, from a systems perspective, if you look at those two universities then they should've also have been allotted the opportunity for a positive GRF dollars. That's where I'm coming from."

Hannig: "But I... I think, Rep..."

Wirsing: "Now... now, if I need to... if I need to get into the more detail then I will. Chicago State University has consistently, like no other university, received increase in GRF. They hold... they hold the record for that. Okay? So, as we moved into this extremely serious, negative budget year, it seems to me that if we're going to look at one university and say because of their size and/or because of their particular mission that this... it doesn't fit. I'm raising that issue. I'm putting it on record that I'm deeply concerned about this. That we need to be very careful that we don't do that. Northeastern University is the most diverse university system if you look at their... the students of all nine public universities in the state. So, if we start selecting out those kind of particular reasoning, the logic for it does not track, it doesn't follow through. And Representative, I'm raising this issue because I'm... I'm... it's a little disappointing to me that we didn't move down kind of an evenness path on this process."

64th Legislative Day

- Hannig: "Representative, all I would say is that for example, in Southern Illinois University we put some additional money in there, \$1.8 million, to reflect the health care exemption for the SIU School of Medicine. They made that case to us, they made that case to the Senate. That money is still in there. And that... that's a bit different from what we did to the other universities, as well. So, I think part of what is happening here at Chicago State as well, is those folks have made the case that they need the extra help. So... and we responded. So that... that..."
- Wirsing: "Well, as I indicated, thank you, Representative. And as I indicated, I'm registering that concern and my concern doesn't go away from that perspective. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Gar... Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. Representative Hannig, are you aware of the salaries of these administrators?"
- Hannig: "Whi... which... which specifically administrators are
 you...?"
- Davis, M.: "I'm speaking of the University of Illinois."
- Hannig: "I know that some of the schools like the University of Illinois, it's our flagship school, has probably one of the higher salaries for administrators for the president, for example."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, if we allow these salaries to continue this way the tuition would have to increase. You

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

have one person making a hundred and fifty-seven thousand; you have someone else making three hundred thirty-five thousand; you have an assistant president, a hundred and one thousand; a government relations, a hundred and thirty-five thousand; a chancellor, two hundred and four thousand; an associate chancellor, hundred and ninety thousand; a university counsel, two hundred thirty-seven thousand; an associate vicepresident, two hundred and fifteen thousand; a vicepresident for academic affairs, two hundred and sixty-two thousand and five hundred dollars, a vicepresident for economic development, two hundred and sixty-two thousand and five hundred dollars."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative..."

Davis, M.: "My question is..."

Hannig: "...but the..."

Davis, M.: "...are you aware of these salaries and are we gonna put some kind of cap on these salary hikes at the University of Illinois for administration?"

Hannig: "Representative, the University of Illinois, along with almost all of the other universities, are seeing a reduction in the amount money that we're giving them. Yeah, at... and we're putting them at the Governor's... at the Governor's level and the Governor's asking them to hold money in reserve."

Davis, M.: "Is the Governor aware of these administrative salaries?"

64th Legislative Day

- Hannig: "I think that's what the Governor is trying to do when he asked these big universities, in particular, to try to reduce their overall spending."
- Davis, M.: "Absolutely. It is... it is just ludicrous to ask students to pay a higher fee and then people who work for the State of Illinois earning these kind of salaries. Is there anything in this legislation, Representative, that would cap them for a few years?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative..."
- Davis, M.: "Will we expect to see this, ya know, just escalate?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, they've advised us in the Appropriation-Higher Ed Committee that they would freeze the administrative salaries. Now, we can't, in an appropriation Bill, actually do substantive changes. So, you would have... someone would have to come forward with a substantive Bill and that would be possible, I think, or at least theoretically you could do that, but we can't do it here in this Bill. This is a spending Bill."
- Davis, M.: "Only about five people at the administrative level make less than a hundred and fifty thousand."
- Hannig: "Yeah, so Representative, we... we appropriated lump sums to the universities, as you... and I think you well know, and we've asked them to freeze the administrative costs, that is the administrative salaries. So we're trying to take action to address the problem that you are seeking. We know it exists and we're trying to address it."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Davis, M.: "To the Bill. Representative Hannig, chairman Slone, I trust that this Body will see that the University of Illinois administrators are not allowed to gouge the public, sit at the public trough and get salaries of three hundred thousand, two hundred thousand, a hundred and ninety-two thousand for work that some people are doing right here in Springfield for sixty thousand and fifty thousand and forty thousand. It is unfair, it is unjust, and now it is time for that to change. If Governor Blagojevich wants to make some changes in the way things are done, this would be a damn good beginning."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Rose. Rose."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, what was the... was the \$366 thousand for Eastern Illinois University taken out of this as it came back from the Senate?"

Hannig: "In the Senate Amendment, that's correct, Representative."

Rose: "And the 5.2 million for the University of Illinois was taken out?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Rose: "But we added, how much? One and a half? 1.6 million for Chicago State. That's correct? Is that what I understand you said earlier?"

Hannig: "1.8 for Chicago State was added and there's still some
 additional money for Southern Illinois."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't hear the Gentleman's response. Thank you. What was your... what your response, Representative?"

Hannig: "1.8 million, 1... \$1,890,400 was added to Chicago State."

Rose: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, everyone in this state has to do its part. Higher education understands that. Everybody knows they've gotta pinch their pennies and tighten their belts, everybody apparently except Chicago State. I don't understand, Ladies and Gentlemen, how we can be taking hits across the board to the entire realm of higher education in this state, higher than anyone else we're being asked to take cuts to, 8.2 percent was what the Governor asked for to Eastern, I believe it was 7.9 at U of I, but hey, let's go give Chicago State a million six, a million eight, whatever. We got money to spend, don't we? Everyone has to pitch in, everyone has to do their part. This is a travesty. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Howard. Howard."

Howard: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a bit troubled by some of the... To the Bill. I'm a bit troubled by some of the things that I'm hearing about the university that has... has had to assume the responsibility of educating individuals from the inner-city, disadvantaged communities, et cetera. Chicago State graduates most of those individuals in that... are residents of this state. I was listening to my colleague who indicated that there are some

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

salaries of individuals at some schools that are... three of those people decided that they didn't ... that they would give up their salaries, we would have enough money to talk about the problem that one of my other colleagues has talked about. We're asking for the million dollars for something that is good and that that school needs to do. We're not squandering money there. It happens to be in my district. I think that we deserve every single cent of that and I think Chicago State does have a reason to say give us some special consideration. If it... if there needs to be some... some close scrutiny of funds, look at some of those salaries that was talked about earlier, \$300 thousand. Some of our instructors at Chicago State make \$60 thousand and as was said, probably do some of the same kind of thing. But we have allowed some universities to continue to ask for money on top of money and there have been very few questions raised as to whether or not they could do without that money. So, I really resent the fact that the school on the southeast side of Chicago that just happens to be in my district, that just happens to be the school that is... is one that my community and others of the Black Caucus look to for our educational programs, is being lambasted the way that Chicago State is. I... I wish that we could get more money, we need more money. We don't ever at Chicago State get as much as others ask for and we don't We need a library, we need a ask for that much. convocation center. Other schools don't have to go other places to... to have their graduation as we do at Chicago

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

State. So yes, we need some consideration to catch up with other schools. I certainly hope that those of you here would look closely at the budget and understand what we're talking about there. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is... Mr. Stephens. Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to pass on some knowledge from our side of the aisle. Chicago State receives more money per student than any university in the State of Illinois, including Illinois... excuse me, in General Revenue Fund. So, I've done my duty, I've passed it on."

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 66 'yeses', 50 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the House does Concur in Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 2663. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the appropriation for K through 12 for the State Board of Education. And what we have done and what the Senate has done is that we began at the Governor's level and we... and let me read the list of restorations that were made in the Senate. The Jobs for Illinois graduates is now back in the program in non-GRF. The truant program is back in at 16 million. Technology for Success is back in. The regional superintendents are back. The school district

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

consolidation money is there. The ag education money has returned. The material for the visually impaired is back, Charter schools textbook programs. In General State Aid, we have been able to inject an additional 53 million 7 hundred primarily for the purposes of beginning the process of funding the poverty head counts on the DHS reports, Department of Human Services, as opposed to the poverty and that's the biggest change that we make in the... in the spending side, that's 53,700,000. We al... Now, we also reduced 11.8 in the 'hold harmless', because it brings some of the poorer schools up. The Math and Science Academy is down by... is eliminated and is also some ... some transitional money that will be needed to make all schools whole, that is the... yeah, that's at 5.2. And the mentoring program, a new program that was proposed, has also been eliminated. So, this proposal that the Governor has given us and that the Senate and we in the House have amended is probably the best education program that we're going to be able to put forward for our schools in this difficult economic time. It allows, in particular, the poorest school districts to try to make progress as they improve and try to better themselves on a per pupil spending basis. So, this Bill goes a long way in addressing many of the needs, particularly in the poor schools in the State of Illinois. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote on the concurrence."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

64th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just have a couple questions regarding the Senate add backs on..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Eddy: "I'm sorry. Can you explain what the Teach for America Program is?"
- Hannig: "It's part of a National Teach for America Program that we have here in Illinois. It's in at 450 thousand."
- Eddy: "What exactly does the program provide for?"
- Hannig: "It takes... it tries to match up some of the better students that are majoring in education and tries to entice them into working in inner-city schools. So, it's an effort to try to bring good, quality teachers in what sometimes is a difficult area to recruit."
- Eddy: "Could it... does it additionally supply funding to provide
 mentoring or induction of teachers as well in this
 program?"
- Hannig: "I'm not certain that that's the case, Representative, it may be, but that... that isn't probably... what we think is the principal function is to... is to help students... teachers find inner city, difficult school placements."
- Eddy: "Would it be fair to state that the \$450 thousand for this program is basically a program that benefits one area, one group of teachers for recruitment, rather than a statewide?"
- Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, I think it's fair to say that this part of the progra... proposal represents the inner-city schools in the state, but I think if you look at other things, the big money, which is in the poverty, affects

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

school districts downstate to a large degree, as well. So, I mean, there is a lot in there for everyone in this proposal."

Eddy: "All right. I understand the affect of the additional funding on the foundation level. I'm just concerned that a particular program in a laundry list of programs that might benefit certain areas seems to have appeared for a particular group when teacher induction and mentoring and other funding for likewise important programs may not be included."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think that's a, ya know, a judgment call that we all have to make. The Governor wanted to exclude a whole list of programs. Some of those were important to people like me on monies for consolidation, because I happen to have a district that fits into that category, there's may be others here that could care less. So, we have to look at... at, ya know, all the needs of all the Legislators and we all come in and weigh in. But as a downstater, I can tell you that this is the best education budget that we're gonna get and if we vote this thing down today, it's only gonna get worse."

Eddy: "Just an interesting inclusion that was not on the radar screen in any of the Appropriations Committee hearings here that added funds back. It just is interesting that this would show up as something that does provide for that area where some of the other concerns that were in some of the Amendments that we were suggesting did not. And that... that's just an observation. I have a question about the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Technology for Success addition. There's eleven and a half million dollars in this line item, it does not fully restore the Technology for Success. Can you elaborate as to the specific intent of this eleven and a half million dollar addition?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, ya... when they... when we talked about these... this is one of the programs the Governor thought that perhaps we could do without. And when we looked at it here in the House and we tried to create our priorities, we too, weren't certain that it was one that we should fund. The Senate after deliberations has come to the conclusion that it's something that they feel strong enough about that they wish to include. I don't disagree with them. I think in a perfect world we do a lot of things that we can't do today. But this is part of the process of a House and a Senate working together with the Governor to try to get a compromise."

Eddy: "Well, and... I guess, in particular, my question is, whether the specific dollars that are restored are for the program known as closing the gap, which is money that is directly provided to school districts to provide upgrades in technology on a rotating basis or if this money is to handle administrative costs and training in technology as opposed to technology infrastructure purpose... purchases?"

Hannig: "I think the... the Senate is trying to restore as much of the program as they feel that they can and perhaps they didn't feel that they could go the full amount, but their hope is that they... that this money will be available, not

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

for administrators, but for school districts to the degree that the money is available."

- Eddy: "As a particular part of the closing the gap, that was a rotating basis program where school districts by quadrant, actually based on their EAD per pupil, received technology rollout funds. And I guess that's what I want to be specific about is, we were in the middle of that cycle, we were not fully finished with the cycle. Is the intent of this funding to finish that cycle so that those schools who did not receive funding receive their share or is this a line item for a different purpose?"
- Hannig: "Well, I think, the State Board is gonna have to decide whether they wanna prorate the money or whether they just wanna do a part of the cycle and come back next year and try to finish it. I mean that... that's, I think, a decision that they have to make, we can only appropriate the money."
- Eddy: "Well, that... that's the concern, is whether or not this money is going to go to school districts for use to upgrade technology used by students in the classroom or if this money is going to go into a line item at the State Board of Education that can be used there for administrative purposes. And that's kinda what I'm trying to get at here as to whether or not this funding will end up in school districts for students."
- Hannig: "The idea is to try to get it into school districts.

 We've also been advised that because of some leasing options that now may be available, we may be able to do everything that we wanted to do but for less money, so..."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy. Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Eddy: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Madigan: "Could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Eddy: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you."

Eddy: "The only other question I have and very quickly to point out that Illinois Century Network has not been reinstated to this budget, it remains at CMS. Is that right?"

Hannig: "That's under the higher... it was under higher ed,

Representative, we talked about, I think, that in the

previous Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Hannig: "But yes."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "To the Bill."

Mitchell, J.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you have to vote your own conscience on this particular Bill. We had several requests from our side of the aisle that were denied. When you look at the \$250 per student, downstaters look at that and say, gee, that's great. But you gotta remember that many non-mandated categoricals were collapsed to get that 250. Now, that's money your districts would've gotten anyway. So, the 250's not really a 250, additional. It's 250 given to you in a different form. Districts will

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

difficult time making а budget. Representative said that this is probably the best budget we can get and anything else will get worse. disagree with that, I don't think that we ever intended to close the equity gap by taking money from some districts that are under tax caps and giving it to other districts. That's not the way to get equity. The money that would've been put in the budget that we has discussed would've given districts enough money, some to survive and some actually keep programs they're going to have to cut. You look at your downstate districts, I've got districts in my area, even with this budget, that are cutting staff, closing buildings and quite possibly gonna be bankrupt before the end of this year. I can't live with that. this the best we can do with the money that's given? Maybe so. But with more revenue we could've taken better care of our kids. This budget is totally inadequate for areas of the state that are desperately going to need the money. This is not going to work well for anyone and I myself cannot in good conscience vote for this particular budget. I would advise all of you to look very closely at it and decide for yourselves, is this good for the... all of the children of Illinois or does it favor some of the kids in Illinois. I would urge an 'aye' vote, send this to Conference Committee and negotiate a better deal. I don't think it'll get worse, I think it can get better. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just like to a just make the comment, at least with this legislation it may not be happy, may not be what... everything for everybody, and I can definitely understand the frustration the previous speaker in regards to categoricals. It does hurt areas in my communities. However, I'm ecstatic to find out that at least in regards to educational funding reform that the census and poverty co... the census data has been switched to count poverty to DHS numbers. It's something that I've been fighting for this entire Session. It's something that we all talked about educational funding reform. It is a... least a true structural change and a step in the right direction towards EFAB's recommendation of adequately funding the minimum level of educational funding here in the State of Illinois and at least it's taken positive steps in that direction. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross.

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, Jerry Mitchell covered this as well as anybody could. And I... but I wanna make it clear that this caucus is very concerned about education in this state. And this budget, unfortunately, and as Jerry mentioned from an equity standpoint is not a good budget for suburban schools, not a good budget whatsoever. In fact, it also goes beyond suburban schools, we're finding in our analysis that it also hurts downstate schools. We have put together a group of people over the last month to analyze this budget, almost on a daily basis,

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

from an educational standpoint: Jerry Mitchell, Rene Kosel, Roger Eddy, Suzie Bassi, Beth Coulson, Carolyn Krause, Joe Dunn to name a few, Sandy Pihos. They have backgrounds as superintendents, as teachers, as school board members. They've been very, very active in the education community. The only way may... that we make this a good budget, the only way we make this a good budget, is to take a look at and include in the budget mandated categoricals and/or ADA block grants. It's imperative that that makes it into this The transitional money that the Governor talks about and I'm... I appreciate his and Mr. Filan's attempts to say this is a good budget, will simply not do the job. you don't have mandated categoricals in this budget, if you don't have ADA block grants and you represent a suburban area in particular, you are harming your school district. It will not have the money it needs. As you know, mandated categoricals take care of special ed needs and also special ed transportation needs. It's imperative that we vote the appropriate way, which is 'no', so we can get... continue to discuss and I'm hopeful that we could... will continue to discuss over the next couple of days and into next week, the need for... the imperative need, for mandated categoricals and ADA block grants. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, do not..., do not leave this chamber and say that your schools are getting \$250 per pupil in new money.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

There is not a student in the State of Illinois, please listen, there is not one student in the State of Illinois that is getting \$250 of new money for education. Be aware of that when you vote on this Bill. Be aware, that through the formula and the collapsing of the funds, that there is no student in this State that is getting \$250 in new money. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. the Bill. I would simply rise in support of this Bill and I commend Representative Hannig and the negotiators who have worked on this. This is, in my estimation, the best education Bill that we're going to see ... education funding Bill we're going to see this Session. This represents what we had identified in the Appropriations Committee as our priorities given the current funding restraints. realize it doesn't do everything for everybody, but I think we have to realize in a year when we're facing a \$5 billion deficit that we're not gonna be able to do everything for everybody. But for some of the comments that have been said on the other side that this doesn't help mandatory categoricals and yes, it doesn't provide funding at a hundred percent. But we are maintaining the same level ... same percentage level as last year and to do that takes an additional \$87 million. That's the singest... single second largest increase in education funding just to maintain the mandatory categoricals. So, I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote for this legislation. This is, in my opinion, the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

best that we're able to do under this circumstance of the \$5 billion deficit this year. This does help our schools. It puts money to those school districts that needs help the most, to the poorest, to the lowest property wealth districts in the state. And for all of my downstate colleagues I would say, this does very well for our downstate school districts. I encourage you to take a close look at your own districts and I encourage you look at the numbers and implore you to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, under the printout we just got from the State Board, which once again does not agree with what my district says they are losing, they list funding increases in mandated categoricals as early childhood, bilingual, GSA foundation level, and DHS poverty grant. In mandated categoricals listed below that are not listed under funding increase, it includes free lunch, orphanage, special education, and transportation. Other categoricals include gifted bilingual, early childhood, ADA block grants. But my question to you is, under mandated categoricals, was the funding eliminated for free lunch, orphanage, special education, and transportation?"

Hannig: "Could you re... could you repeat the last part of the question? I didn't hear it."

Mulligan: "Under mandated categoricals that are not listed on the printout from the State Board of Education that were

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

not increased it lists: free lunch, orphanage, special education, and transportation as mandated categoricals, but they are not listed under funding increased. Have they been eliminated?"

- Hannig: "No, Representative, they've not been eliminated, they've been maintained."
- Mulligan: "Under other categoricals they have a number of things, some of which were listed under increases and other weren't. Could you specify specifically what mandated categoricals have been eliminated?"
- Hannig: "No mandated categoricals have been eliminated, Representative. We continue to fund them at the same reimbursement rate as we did last year, in spite of the fact that that does cost us additional money. That's, ya know, that's a significant cost of this budget is maintaining mandated categoricals at last year's level."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, under our analysis says mandated categorical funding was reduced by a hundred and twenty-three million dollars, that the Senate, what they did was they reduced that out. So, the Amendment that we added for education that was sent to the Senate is not included in this budget."
- Hannig: "Representative, remember we didn't send the Bill to the Senate on education. We... we had a Bill that was worked on in committee over here, your side of the aisle put some Amendments on and that was one of them."
- Mulligan: "All right. So you... it never went out of the House to the Senate?"

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Hannig: "It never went ou... it never went out of the House and the Senate, yesterday by 40 votes, sent us this Bill on education spending that didn't deal with the issue. So, there's no cut, Representative."

"Well, Representative, I will say to you that I normally don't work on education budget except as it affects my own districts because I work on Human Services. But I will tell you that from what my school districts tell me, any suburban Legislator that votes for this budget has a problem going home and trying to explain to their local school districts what we did with the money that was cut out of this budget that impacts our district. And when the Governor repeats repeatedly, that there was increase, I don't want the soccer moms in my district to be portrayed... thinking that this Governor is the 'Education Governor' that is helping my district, because they're not. They are not getting that money because we're flat grant or we don't get that kind of money. And then you cut mandated categoricals. So, this budget is very lean when it impacts particularly the suburban districts of Chicago..."

Hannig: "Repre... Repre..."

Mulligan: "...Cook County area."

Hannig: "Representative, the cost is \$87 million just to maintain the mandated categoricals at the 91 percent level. So, when you look at 91 percent this year and 91 percent last year, it isn't like that's just zero, that costs us... that costs us a significant amount money. Early childhood is in this budget and... at 29 million over. I mean, the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

budget is over the Governor's proposed level by about a hundred... almost a hundred and one million dollars. So, this isn't about cuts, there were a few cuts and I mentioned them earlier with mentoring, teachers academy, and we were able to reduce 'hold harmless', but for the monies that go to your school and my school there were mostly increases or... or they were held constant."

Mulligan: "Well, I would agree with only half that statement, probably the money that goes to your schools has increased the money that goes to my schools has not."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mautino: "Under the... under the budget we had... had concerns early on and I had some of my elementary schools districts that were very hard hit by the census count. One, specifically being, Streator Elementary in one of my towns that's been hard hit. They were gonna lose about a million dollars under the original way that census count came out. Looking at firing about 19 teachers and throwing that school district into pretty much of a fray. How is the structure of the... the Human Services gonna impact?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, when you and I talked to our downstate superintendents almost invariably they tell us we need more money to go into the foundation level and we need to move away from this census count that is frozen in stone for ten years and move to some kind of poverty count that the Department of Human Services can maintain and provide

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

for us. This Bill does both. And that's why I said earlier, that it's the best thing that we've seen for downstate in a long time."

Mautino: "So, for my schools in LaSalle and Mendota and Streator that were hit, this would... we'd be able to use, if Dr. Miller's formula worked better for us, that would be fine. If we were better under the census, it was kind of an either/or. Isn't it, that's my understanding?"

Hannig: "I think, Representative, we're just going to DHS, but I can't imagine that there'll be anyone..."

Mautino: "No, I..."

Hannig: "...that there'll be any loss I mean..."

Mautino: "And actually, they... staff had just showed me those numbers and I do appreciate that. What's our dollar per student that we're looking at?"

Hannig: "Yeah, if the Governor's increase of \$250 per pupil..."

Mautino: "Okay."

Hannig: "...in the foundation is in here, that puts us up to, I think, 4810. And then you have the other big item, as I mentioned, is the money to move from a poverty census count to a Department of Human Services count, which is clearly much more accurate and much... and very much something that downstate superintendents have wanted for many, many years."

Mautino: "Now, whether the… whether the number hits 250 or not, I've heard some… some interesting arguments. But over the past ten years we've struggled to put basically a hundred dollars per year per student into the formula. And so,

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

under this program everybody or all the schools... would it be fair to say are at least we're putting double the money back that we have in previous years?"

Hannig: "Representative, for the schools that are under the General State Aid formula on the foundation level this is... this is the best that they've seen in probably three years. And I think when you look in light of the fact that what's going on all over this nation with the economy in a slump and states struggling for revenues, we've seen huge, huge cuts in education funding all up... all up and down the nation in other states. And I think it's to the credit of the Governor and to our credit that we've been able to put together a proposal that's 60 votes away from going to the Governor to provide this additional funding for our children."

Mautino: "Back in 1995, it was traditionally the schools under the General State Aid formula received about 53 cents on the dollar for every new dollar going into education. And I do stand in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. That formula was changed in 1995 and that number has gone down to the point where we've seen about 42 cents on every new dollar that have been going into that fund. So, given the change in that formula, I don't see how we can turn down the opportunity to put double the money back in. It's gonna put extra dollars into a lot of the school districts. And if we looked at even using our past year's numbers at a hundred million or a hundred dollars per student, most of the downstate school districts that weren't in the 'hold

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

harmless' category would've been hurt. So, in a tough budget year I would just urge support. Take a look at your numbers, take a look at your schools. Ya know what, maybe the number is not \$250 per student, so what. Are they getting an increase? Are they not losing money out of our over 900 school districts that are out there? Ya know, you can argue percentages, 78 percent of all percentages are made up on the spot. We do it on the House here daily. Bottom line is... and that's my shot at it, too, by the way. But bottom line is, do they get more money? If it... if you're gonna argue they didn't get \$250, so what. you're right. Did they get more? Will they have the opportunity to go forward to get the new technologies and to provide a brighter future? Based on additional dollars per student, I think the answer is 'yes'. And for that, in a bad budget year, we should go forward with these, make sure the kids do get that opportunity. It may not be ideal to everyone's liking, but we're five billion in the hole, we have to deal with that. And I think this is the best that we can do."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker. I don't... I've actually never stood up in five years to speak on an education funding Bill, but I feel it's important to correct a misimpression that one of the suburban Legislators articulated earlier. And I want to make sure on behalf of my school districts that the information we have received is, in fact, correct. So, a

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

question to the Sponsor, isn't it correct that we are not cutting mandated categoricals in any way in this Bill?"

Hannig: "Could you repeat the... repeat the question?"

Hamos: "We are not cutting mandated categoricals? In fact there's an increase of, I think, you said \$87 million.

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, sometimes people are misled when they see that the mandated categorical level has remained at 91 percent. And they say, oh, that doesn't help us any. But it does help those schools and that's all of our schools, because it costs us \$80 million. Now, that's an important element of what I believe the suburban school districts look at in any budget. So, there's \$80 million that's going to serve all school districts around the State of Illinois. When you link that with the Governor's transitional money so that no school district will be a loser, I can't understand for the life of me how anyone could be against this proposal."

Hamos: "So, once again, you... will you just pointed to transitional funding of, we understand, \$5.2 million and is that not a guarantee that no school district will receive less combined total of all of the different grant programs, mandated categoricals and state aid. No school district will receive less. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, there's transitional money that's in this budget for the State Board of Education to make grants to school districts when they... when they can show that they would have... that they have lost money because of this budget.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

So, we're trying to make sure that all interests from all around the state are protected."

Hamos: "So, I understand... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I understand that in this... in this budget year, we, despite the fact that it was a tough budget many of us hoped and wished that we could increase the mandated categorical lines on behalf of the suburban school districts, but it is not correct, as one of my colleagues earlier intimated, that suburban school district Representatives should not be able to go home and feel proud that we did as best as we could without any district losing money. And therefore, as a suburban Legislator, I rise in support of this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, two or three quick questions. On the transition money, how will that be determined, if that's the ri... what are the determination factors as to what districts get transition money? Is it the overall FY03 to FY04 comparison and then the transition money goes up to hold you harmless or how exactly does that work?"

Hannig: "The State Board of Education will have the money in their budget, a line item, and then they'll run the program to make schools who have losses, that is net losses, they can come then to the State Board and say we need some of this transitional money. Now, the State Board may ask for a look at their books or things like that, but that's how

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

the program will work. We have 'hold harmless' money ready. This will be a different kind of calculation and this is transitional money."

Black: "Would it then be a fair statement to say, as the Governor said in a press conference earlier in the week, that no school district will lose any net dollars?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Black: "And, ya know, it's a little hard for me to understand that because we're doing the spending before I know the revenue, but I won't berate that issue. We've talked about that a hundred times. There was a... an offer made by the State Board of Education a week or two ago that they could find \$30 million in administrative cuts and redirects that they suggested, the State Board suggested, could go into the mandated categoricals which would then bring the 91 percent level up to 93 percent. It appears that we didn't follow up on that or determine that it wouldn't work or..."

Hannig: "Some of the things that they proposed, Representative, like the teachers academy and mentoring, we did cut. But again, on the mandated categoricals, sometimes there's an illusion that because we're going from 91 percent to 91 percent that it didn't cost the state money... that it didn't cost the state any money, that it's level funding, but in fact we had to spend \$80 million just to maintain that level. Had we kept it at level funding the percentage would've dramatically fallen. So, for those school districts who are primarily interested in mandated categoricals, I would say that they've done very well."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the If there's anything that makes this even partially palatable it's the work that Representative Miller did on the poverty figure. That is certainly going to help some districts, not only in FY04, but I think it will help many districts throughout the next decade because at least they have an alternative to census figures that devastated some districts that I represent under the 1990 census. course, you can't appeal those numbers, so that poverty grant was a tremendous loss. However, I... for the record, again, we fal into the habit here of saying fully funded I would remind all of you that when we fund categoricals. categorical... mandated categorical programs, even if we had the money to do a hundred percent funding this year of mandated categoricals, that's funding a small portion of the cost of the program. We fund special education on the basis of sending a school district \$8,000 for a special ed teacher. There isn't a special ed teacher anywhere in the country that works for \$8,000. And when we had the Committee of the Whole, I think that's what I came away more than anything else, that the mandated with categoricals at no matter what level you fund them, most just in special education, having to districts are appropriate from local sources millions of dollars in order to pay for just special education costs alone. So, we sometimes get hung up on the jargon down here that if we fully fund mandated categoricals we're taking care of all the cost connected with those categorical programs.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

we're not, even in the best years we're not. And I think... I think the chairman, Representative Hanniq, makes a good point. As those costs go up every year, nothing is static. But to walk out of here and say, well, I demanded one hundred percent or fully funding categoricals. fully fund categoricals. We haven't in my tenure here because we fund them at a statutory level and the special ed statutory level I don't believe has been changed since about 1985. So, we have a long way to go on meeting our commitment to public education. As someone said earlier, we may be doing the best we can and honest differences of opinion may exist on whether or not that's good enough and whether or not we have prioritized as best we can. But my point is and I won't berate it all day long, it's very hard to prioritize spending when you do that first. I'm being asked to prioritize spending when I don't have a real good idea of how much money we're actually gonna have to spend. One of these days maybe we can turn this thing around and do the spending side of the budget first, then we can do a much better job of prioritizing how we spend the money. I think we do it just backwards and I think that leads to some of the confusion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question... questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Stephens: "Representative, help me understand. I'm just looking at some staff work here, totals including House

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Bill 2663. Can you help me understand why Chicago gets 7.2 percent, other Cook Counties gets 8.1 percent, collar counties get 6.78 percent and downstate, that would include you and me, 5.22? We have analyzed this thing from... this Bill and Amendments every which way, all kinds of different situations. And Gary, on every one of 'em, every one with or without the Amendments and some combination thereof, downstate gets the shaft."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Stephens: "I mean it..."

Hannig: "...I would respectfully disagree. I mean, whenever we talk to our superintendents they say, give us a poverty count that makes sense and fund it. This Bill does that. They say, help us with the foundation level and put the money there first. This Bill does it. Now, I'm looking at your district in this printout, Representative, and it says you get an increase of over \$3 million. Now to..."

Stephens: "I'm all... I'm for that."

Hannig: "...me that seems like a pretty good deal. This Bill got 40 votes in the Senate. It wasn't, ya know, it was highly debated, but it was not a partisan issue. I think people from all around the state can see that there are no losers, there are only winners under this program."

Stephens: "I... I, first of all, I would admonish you. Don't look to the Senate for advice, 40 'yes' votes on a Bill just makes us have to look at it with more scrutiny. In any case, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Yes, some districts are going to win, but trust me, some are going to lose.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

And it's clear in our analysis, which I depend on, that in every case it's going to be downstate as a group with an occasional school district being higher, but many lower. And with that, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate the work, Mr. Hannig, that you've done and done over the years on this budget. Just got off the phone to the business manager for 61. So, when we talk about these printouts and say your district gets three million more, four million more, or whatever. Talked to my business manager, he knows the integral details of District 61 in Decatur. He knows, he does it every day. I said, 'Mr. Getty', I said, 'my printout says 61's a winner by a hundred thousand dollars or so'. I said, 'what is your view, what's it going to mean, this budget to the classroom?' And he says, 'Representative, we know it's tough times', he says, 'this might be the best we could get.' However, according to his analysis, Decatur 61 will lose \$400 thousand for the classroom, where we want to make sure the money goes. So, this is not a good budget for education, at least for the people of central Illinois. I represent a district, Olympia, along with Representative Sommers, 400 square miles. It's one of the largest area square district... school districts in the State of Illinois. They're projected a \$3 million deficit. They've done everything the state has said to do. They've consolidated, they're in about five counties. They can't do anymore

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

consolidation. This budget says, which I think these numbers are overly optimistic, they're gonna get a few more dollars. But next year I'm afraid unless the State of Illinois gets serious about how we fund public schools, they're going to have to make some serious cuts. That's not right. This is not a good budget for the people of Illinois, in particularly of central Illinois. I will vote 'no'."

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 66 people voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2663. The Chair recognizes Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Purpose of an announcement.

Today is Mike Smith's birthday and he would like all of you to come down to the front and enjoy the host of cookies he brought in. They're down in the boxes. Let's wish him all a happy birthday today."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2716. Mr. Hannig."

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

The Senate has given us in this Bill, the Department of
Children and Family Services, the Department of Human
Services, the Department of Public Aid, Public Health and
Veterans Affairs. The... the Senate reduced \$18 million of

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

the initiative for Most Troubled Kids in the Department of Children and Family Services, that was one of the major issues there. The Senate put \$8 million in the long-term... cut \$8 million, I'm sorry they restored \$8 million to the long care... long-term care line. And the Alzheimer's Program was transferred back to the Department of Public There's \$1.4 million in the expenses for prostate cancer awareness and there's an additional million dollars in the minority AIDS/HIV Prevention and Outreach Program. Those are the... and there's also \$1.3 million for Manteno home for an additional 38 beds. And 426 thousand for the Anna home in Veterans Affairs for equipment. Those are the major changes that the Senate made. I move for the... that we concur in the Senate Amendment. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Brosnahan: "Gary, can you please explain or kinda walk me through what happened to the fund for the Alzheimer's prevention?"

Hannig: "It was moved from Public Health to Public Aid so that we can get federal match."

Brosnahan: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I stand in reluctant support of this Bill. Human Services takes care of Illinois' most vulnerable citizens with developmental disabilities. Our state now ranks 48th in its spending for community services. Our record is really inexcusable when

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

it comes to this. The last funding increase for community organizations was July 2000. Community organizations continue to increase services even with challenging In the past five years, organizations cash budgets. reserves have deteriorated from 90 days working cash to less than 30 days. In fiscal year 2002 the survey organizations paid \$2.7 million in short-term investment to meet payroll and other expenses. This translates to about \$30 million in short-term interest payments statewide. Also, first year direct care staff are turning over at a rate of 80 percent. I know there's some legislation and I'm sure most of us have read about it in the paper today, pending in Washington that's gonna bring new money into the State of Illinois. Some newspapers are quoting that it's gonna go over \$400 million. I think more likely what we're probably talking about maybe 300 or 325 million dollars in new money to the state. And I would just urge that as these new revenues come into Illinois we commit these new resources to fund community services to people with disabilities and their families. There's three things we should really prioritize: the cost of doing business increase, living wages for nonadministrative staff, and trying to service those people waiting for community services. And the important thing to remember is all three of these programs I just mentioned are all federally matched programs. So, whatever the total cost is the State of Illinois' cost is 50 percent, I just hope that's what our priority is. I hope this isn't the end of it for DHS

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

budget. I hope that as new money coming in we could reprioritize. And again, I will support this Bill, but I certainly have some serious concerns. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, I'd like to go over just a few details of this budget or things that were cut by the Senate. I understand, although we did not do anything with the DCFS budget... S budget here, that the Senate cut the, I'm gotta look at the name of the program, \$18-some million for the training for the Troubled Kids Program."

Hannig: "The program development for troubled kids was eliminated in the Senate and it's my understanding that it was a new initiative from the Governor, neither... no one in the Senate seemed to be comfortable with it. I don't think that they received any information on the program and so it was eliminated."

Mulligan: "The Governor received a report that covered some of the problems in DCFS before he appointed a new director. One of the main problems being a very troubled... extremely troubled kids in some facilities in districts around the state. Those are kids that were normally sent out-of-state before that are inappropriately mixed with other wards of the state. In some instances, if those children are hospitalized in mental health facilities or locked mental health facilities the cost is approximately \$800 a day. And it was obvious that some institutions that thought they

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

could handle this particular group of young people could not and that at least part of this money should've been left in the budget because we need to address those problems. I think that it was short-sighted on the Senate to cut the total amount out."

Hannig: "Yeah, I don't think the agency came in and resisted the cut in either the House or the Senate. They did tell us that they have about \$7 million to deal with these kind of problems that already are in the budget. So, perhaps that's why."

Mulligan: "Well, part of the problem that the committee had...

the Human Service-Appropriation Committee had with the previous director and the day that we met the new director, I don't think he'd been appointed for more than day and his background is not necessarily in this area, was that they would not address the situation that, in places such as Maryville, where the intake has been closed and that we had this large category of kids that can't even be mixed into public schools and some of them should be in locked facilities for any number of reasons. They also are a danger to the staff. And it certainly was a new category where at lest some money should've been left in the budget for that."

Hannig: "Yeah, there..."

Mulligan: "I'm just pointing out that I think it's a very poor cut."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I... we... we didn't receive any information from the agency to a large degree either in the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

House, but we tried to keep it in and give them a chance to focus. But I think in the Senate at some point you have to say if the agency can't come forward and explain their new initiative in a time when we don't have a lot of money and when there is additional money in the budget to deal with these kind of problems already, that maybe they should come back next year when they're a little more organized."

Mulligan: "Well, it's leaving those young people and the people that they're mixed in with in limbo, in institutional setting that is not appropriate."

Hannig: "I..."

Mulligan: "And so..."

Hannig: "But I'm advised there is some money to deal with these
kind of items, Representative."

Mulligan: "Also, that there is some money in the Human Service budget that would be outlined as... as normally would be Member initiatives. Mostly when we give out Member initiatives everyone knows it's a onetime only, no matter how worthy the project is. Some of those were definitely included in this Bill and we find a problem with that. I understand that the state borrowed money to pay off providers at less than 1 percent and that those checks are going out."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, the state has borrowed some money and is in the process of paying Medicaid providers."

Mulligan: "In testimony that was repeatedly provided before the House Human Service Committee, many of those providers stated that there was a significant amount of interest that

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

they were paying on loans that they had already taken in order to pay those bills just to make payroll. I think the state is remiss if we do not pass some kind of legislation that would investigate what they actually cost, because I see no provision in this Bill to pay them for what it's going to cost them in interest. And then we dragged our feet as far as getting loans to repay them when we're doing it at less then 1 percent and some of them are doing that at significantly higher. So, this budget does not include anything for that, but I think the state needs to take note of the fact that we are definitely harming many providers. Large groups, such as Lutheran Social Services, Catholic Charities cashed in on their foundation money, money that will probably not be regenerated in this poor economy at a bad time... to cash in investments to cover the cost of payments that they had to make to keep their services available that the state avails them self of, of a less than reasonable cost. And I think it should be noted that although this budget does not address it that we should take a hard look at how we could maybe address it for these institutions and providers in future days."

Hannig: "I would agree with that, Representative."

Mulligan: "Of the monies that we put in, in the addition to the Human Service budget, it is my understanding that the Senate did not cut any of those, they moved a few around. The only thing they did do was they took back some money in the Department of... to DC... to DHS, I think, from the Department of Public Aid that we had moved because we

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

wanted to get matching federal funds. And that the Senate decided it was too much and moved part of it back. I wish there would be a reconsideration of that."

Hannig: "Representative, we were advised by the agency that they thought that what the Human Service had provi… had proposed was a good idea. They wanted to move in that direction, but they couldn't do it all on July 1, and so they're trying to work on phasing it in."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if it's possible and there's a supplemental and they don't need that money, could we revise that at some point so that we can get the matching federal funds?"

Hannig: "Yeah, absolutely, Representative."

Mulligan: "The mandate of the committee and from some of the agencies said, if it walks, it talks, we Medicaid it. And my feeling is that we need to take... avail ourselves of anything that we can do matching federal funds for and be more cautious of what we're doing in these budgets. And if it appears because... one of the problems that I've had this whole year... budget year, is that the Governor's introduced budgets did not necessarily match with the agency budgets and there was a lot of inability to explain that. So, at some point I feel we're gonna have to address some of these budgets again, whether it be a supplemental at some future date, let's hope it's not 'til Veto Session, but I'm concerned about that. That we will look at those line items and I don't know if we can arrange that in a supplemental, but do something that would maybe allow us to

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

capture more matching federal funds because I think it's gonna be a big problem for this budget."

Hannig: "I... I would... I would agree with everything you said,

Representative."

"I'd like to get you on record on that agreement, because it's something that I hope we're gonna do. Another big concern I have in the Human Service budget, which I've reiterated several times, is that providers across the board are going to be asked to sign contracts that will contain a clause that says they must accept a 2 percent reserve, which doesn't allow them to adequately plan a budget for a year if they're gonna be cut an additional 2 percent over and above what they're already being cut and providers are going to have a very difficult time. other thing is, we're passing a budget out here in Human Services and we have not addressed such things as minimum wage or unionization. And although I'm not ... will not make a statement how I feel about that one way or the other, I will make a statement that one does not follow without the money following to go to providers to assist them in covering the higher costs that they may receive. budget is inadequate for that because we have not put in any additional money that we even cut last year, we only raised levels to the money that was already put in the budget for last year. So, if any of those things happen, the budgets will be totally inadequate for providers that provide services and in some instances benefits. So, that

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

must be carefully considered if those Bills are to come to the House Floor either today or next week."

Hannig: "I think you make some very good points, Representative. We can address the issue of the 2 percent setback in an appropriation Bill, but it... but I think it troubles all of us. And the increase in the minimum wage clearly can have a impact on this budget. So, you are correct."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan, could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Mulligan: "Yes. I think I've addressed most of the concerns that not only our party but your party had in hearings on the Department of Human Services. I know this is a very tough budget year. I would like to make us aware of the fact that this should be an ongoing process because I feel the budgets do not match up and I think we're gonna have to be very careful with what happens as the year progresses. Thank you for your work in this area."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we know, this budget is very, very important and as the previous speaker mentioned and actually all the previous speakers have talked about, there's still some things that have to be done here. When we talk about there's a un... you know there's a unanimous agreement that developmental disabilities underfunding is totally unacceptable at this stage and there's so many items we still need to address to make sure that the most vulnerable are addressed. We gotta make sure also that we

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

know that last night there was a vote in Congress, the tax cut and that the State of Illinois has an opportunity to receive a compromise in terms of getting some dollars here. And we know that there will be some monies available, anywhere close to 300 million. The total package is 780 million, knowing that about 430 is committed already, or 389 if you... 380 are committed to Medicaid and that there will be dollars available for flexible state grants. we need to stay attuned to what Congress does and hopefully on Tuesday we'll see a full vote and know where those dollars and how much of that is coming in as anticipated And based on this information, we have some issues here because the cost of a 50 cent raise an hour for the workers in developmental disabilities would only cost \$20 million out of that projected windfall bringing it to the State of Illinois. We have an annual turnover of 80 percent of our... of those workers and that definitely it continues to hurt the quality of care. So, I, too, will be voting on this budget and I know we have to pass this budget today but we need to revisit this issue next week as soon as we can, because DD cannot wait another year. And I do commend those who I know will be dealing with a task force and we wanna do... focus a little bit on developmental disabilities. And I would keep our eye on what's going on and let's make sure we do the best for those who are gonna need us throughout their lifetime. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Stephens: "Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. This Bill includes the Office of Veterans Affairs. I have made several pleas to either get my colleagues to hold this Bill or the other to get the Governor to sit down with us. I will repeat that Hal Fritch was the Medal of Honor winner, unfairly treated by the department under the Ryan Administration. We have a chance to make up for the mistakes of that prior administration. I would ask that he be rehired and a letter be put in his file that he didn't do all the crazy things that they were charging him with. With that, I urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, B.: "Representative Hannig, is there a line item in this budget for Lincoln Developmental Center?"

Hannig: "There is not, Representative, not a line item."

Mitchell, B.: "And it left the House and there was no line item. I was told in the Senate they were gonna put a line item in there, there were no line item in there. I think it's ea... you could put a, ya know, line item in there with zero dollars would've been better than having... I don't know how we're going to get... and the Governor has given us an assurance that there's \$10 million. It hasn't been in there yet and they've had several add-ons just to the... to the Bill. It's my understanding that there's a \$200 thousand grant for the... which is a great program for the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Easter Seal Dental Program, which is mainly in the Chicago area, that was an add-on; \$250 thousand is for the Vision of Hope for the Illinois Eye Institute in Chicago, that was an add-on; 780 thousand is back for the Children's Place located in the City of Chicago. All those are very admirable programs and they're all located in the City of Chicago. Where is the funding for Lincoln Developmental Center?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry, what was the last part of the question?"

Mitchell, B.: "Where is the funding? I'm assured it's gonna be there, it's gonna be there. Now, I'm gonna take Governor Blagojevich at his word, but it's late in the process, they've had ample opportunity to put it in here in the House, in the Senate and it ain't there."

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Mitchell, B.: "Where is it?"

Hannig: "I don't know the answer. First of all, I think you should talk to the Governor who... if he made a promise to you, you should ask him how he intends to keep it. Secondly, there are large lump sums in the budget from which grants can be made and, ya know, that may be where the Governor's looking to try to fund this, but I don't know the answer to that, I'm just trying to give you my honest opinion."

Mitchell, B.: "And I appreciate that, Sir. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McKeon."

McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanna thank the Appropriations Committee and Representative Hannig for the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

effort they've put into this. Most of the comments I'd like to make were made by my colleague, Representative Delgado, and I thank him for that, he's done a... did a great I'm deeply troubled about this budget, particularly in the mental health, the DD area for both children and adults. And particularly given my district, I have three of the largest programs that deal with residential adult and children with developmentally disabilities that are in community, working in the community, some need considerable care, such as Misericordia, on my... just north of my district, others work in a structured work setting like Anixter, just south of my district, and then directly my district, the Victor Neumann's Association Thresholds. I haven't decided how to vote on this issue. I'm deeply troubled by it. I would like to see us may be move this into a Conference Committee and spend another couple of days or at least one more day working on this. It's... this is probably the single most important issue to my district. And I haven't made a decision yet, it'll probably be at the time the Roll Call has been made. But I think we can do better, as Jerry Mitchell said, when he was talking about the education budget. We can do better, we can do better than this. It's an issue of priorities, the Governor's priorities, and priorities that some of us have here. And I think we can sit down when we come back on Tuesday and try to work through some of these issues and deal with some of the... the problems in the DD, mental health, substance abuse areas, homeless areas that really

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

have a major impact on my district. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The other night you heard me address House Bill 3788, and you are kind enough to work with this side of the aisle and your side of the aisle in putting together many of the defects in House Bill 3788. And one of the things I feared the most, when I talked to you about that Bill, was the very thing that we are facing today, that the Senate would send back to us or send to us a Bill that did not adequately fund or take care of our most vulnerable citizens. Now, there's not a person in this chamber that isn't committed to helping people that need our assistance. You've seen them on the streets, you've seen them in homes, you've seen them in the columns in the great halls of this Capitol asking for your help, asking for your assistance. These are real people, real people that come to us and ask government to assist them to achieve their goals, their dreams in life. Let me just take you through, if I can, the commencement of a problem of a person born with a disability. Oh yes, we all, when we've gotten married, have all the greatest hopes and dreams for every bit of future for every child that we have. But, do you know what it's like to face a young child at birth that cannot roll over at the age of six, that cannot walk at the age of one, that cannot talk until later stages of life? people that turn to us for help at the initial stages of

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

their life, whether through early intervention, whether through assistance at schools. And throughout their early years, they call upon this government to provide necessary services so they can cope with the hardships of life. as I address this Bill right now, I want you to think of somebody growing up with a disability, but not at the same time to remember that this could be your parent, this could be a brother or sister or another loved one that faces a disability because of an accident with an automobile or a home accident itself. So, as I ask the Sponsor of this Bill if he'll yield to a question, I want you to keep in mind the very services that this state provides for the disabled as they struggle through life to seek the best in their lives. Mr. Sponsor, does this Bill, the DHS portion, contain any fund raise... any increase in per hour wage increase for personal care assistants?"

Hannig: "Representative, we... we... last... or, earlier this week sent a number of Bills to the Senate dealing with the DHS budget. One Bill has come back here, another Bill, as you well know, is still in the Senate. They have a week left to deal with that issue. I think that the best thing that we can do..."

Daniels: "Does this Bill...

Hannig: "Well, I think...

Daniels: "Just a simple 'yes' or 'no'."

Hannig: "...the best thing we can do..."

Daniels: "Does it contain a dollar an hour wage increase?"

Hannig: "This Bill does not ...

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Daniels: "Okay."

Hannig: "...but there's a Bill that's alive and well in the Senate that could go directly to the Governor with 30 votes..."

Daniels: "I... I understand."

Hannig: "...if that chamber would so desire."

Daniels: "If they so desire, but they have sent me... I addressed the Senate appropriation committee yesterday, asked them to assist in it, and the Bill that you are talking about is still pending in the Senate, we don't know if it will. Let me just remind the Body here, that if you nonconcur in this budget, it goes to Conference Committee, if the Sponsor asks it to go to Conference Committee. They could meet over the weekend, put the amount of money in the Bill, and then bring it back for a vote as early as Tuesday when we return, which is a possibility. So, the answer is this Bill does not contain a dollar an hour wage increase. Does this Bill increase the payment cycle for intermediate care facilities?"

Hannig: "It... yes it does, Representative."

Daniels: "All right. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just listen to that. Previously, you've heard House Bills sponsored by the speaker, and you've all supported those, which decreased the payment cycle or it created a prompt payment cycle for the intermediate care facilities and others to promptly pay their bills. This Bill takes the payment cycle that is already inadequate and increases the

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

payment cycle making it more difficult to receive money for the providers of this state."

Hannig: "Representative, it... it increases..."

Daniels: "Mr. Sponsor. No, I've..."

Hannig: "...it up to 30 days, you know..."

Daniels: "It still increases the payment cycle. Mr. Sponsor, does this Bill have any kind..."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Daniels: "...of a cost of living increase for the developmentally disabled community and those providers?"

Hannig: "Representative, this Bill does not contain any of the items that were in your proposal that passed this House overwhelmingly and is now in the Senate."

Daniels: "So, the answer is 'no'? This Bill does not contain it?"

Hannig: "This Bill does not. A House Bill in the Senate does, Representative."

Daniels: "And you remember, of course, why that Bill was passed. Why 3738, the Bill you're referring to, passed this House because we held up the DHS budget because we made sure that it didn't get out of this House until those amounts were in it and that's what we oughta be doing now with this concurrence. We oughta nonconcur. We oughta insist that the money's in this Bill and the Bill being sent to the Governor, so he has it fully together."

Hannig: "Or we could pass this Bill..."

Daniels: "Mr. Sponsor..."

Hannig: "...and ask that the Senate..."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Daniels: "Yes."

Hannig: "...pass the other Bill to the Governor, Representative."

Daniels: "And you're gonna promise me that occurs?"

Hannig: "Pardon me?"

Daniels: "You're gonna promise me that occurs?"

Hannig: "Representative..."

Daniels: "Of course you aren't..."

Hannig: "...you know that I can't promise you that."

Daniels: "...of course you aren't."

Hannig: "And I can't promise you..."

Daniels: "But this Bill, this Bill..."

Hannig: "...and I can't promise that if..."

Daniels: "...that's under your control right now, we could nonconcur, put the amount of money in it, and in a Conference Committee, and then pass it through a Conference Committee Report. Does this money have any increase in amounts for supported employment?"

Hannig: "Representative, I think I've answered your questions."

Daniels: "Okay, the answer is 'no'. Now, unfortunately, we're facing a crisis. Obviously, I understand the difficult position you're in, Representative, because you are being forced to place a Bill before us that's inadequate in amount. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. This state fell... finds itself in crisis. A continuing increase in the average of 10 percent in the number of people with developmental disabilities needing services. Twenty thousand people with developmental disabilities who are cared for at home, by their parents,

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

are projected by the University of Illinois to be forced to have assistance within the next 15 years, for aging caregivers that die, and their adult children with developmental disabilities move into state-funded services. An increase in the complexity of services are needed, and yet, unmet by this Bill. There is no cost of living increase for this Bill and there has been none in this state for the last three years. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now is the time to act. Now, is the time to stand up and say we can stop this Bill and nonconcur. Every vote in this House will count as to your feelings on the people with developmentally disabilities and mental illness. It's not something that's a 'pig in the poke' and a promise for tomorrow, as the Sponsor may lead us to believe. We can do it now. We can do it in this House if you nonconcur. I ask, I implore on behalf of every person with mental disabilities or physical disabilities to nonconcur in this vote. Stop this Bill now when we have an opportunity to do it, instead of a promise of maybe something will happen tomorrow. You heard, from a previous speaker, there's \$780 million earmarked for this state from the Federal Government for additional funds that we could use for these purposes. Do what we need to do now, today, and support those people that are most vulnerable in this society. Meet your campaign speeches and pledges when you ran for this office in the first place, Democrat and Republican alike, and help those people that need your help the most. Vote this Concurrence Motion down. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

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? Has Mr. Lang voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 people voting 'yes', 55 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2716. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2700, Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the last of the four Bills that the Senate sent us for consideration. It considers the Department of Agriculture, appellate defender's, appellate prosecutor's, auditor general, CMS, Commerce and Economic Opportunity, comptroller, Corrections, Court of Claim, Education Labor Relations Board, elections, General Assembly, Illinois Labor Relations Board, judiciary, the legislative support agencies, the management and budget, the Department of Revenue, Secretary of State, State Police, Supreme Court, transportation, and treasurer. So, those are the... those are the items that the budget contains. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Embodied in one Bill, the appropriation language in... I can't even count that high, 3-6-9, looks like about 12

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

totally distinct and separate state agencies. Some of these... some of these appropriation Bills have certain items in them that I personally am opposed to. And I think what we do here is sometimes put all of these in one Bill and that way somebody says, well, I don't like what's in here but I like what's in there. So, it gets enough votes to pass. Mr. Speaker, again, I will... I'm not gonna make an issue out of it, but I will ask the Chair, in my opinion I would think House Bill 27 would be divisible and that if you would agree, I would ask that we divide the question and vote on each agency appropriation in 2700 as a separate item."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, I believe that I issued a ruling on this question a few days ago, and the ruling would remain the same, which is that this question is not divisible."

Black: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I commend you. I don't think you're right, but at least you're consistent."

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 70 people voting 'yes', 45 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2700. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1754? It's on page 19 of the Calendar."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1754, a Bill for an Act creating the Western Illinois Economic Development Authority. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Smith, has been approved for consideration."

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

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Amendment #2 would simply add the language that we debated and passed out of here a couple of days ago in Senate Bill 1212, which would require projects under the development authority created by this Act to... to be covered by the Prevailing Wage Act. These are public funds which are being used and the Amendment simply clarifies that any projects receiving the money will be subject to the prevailing wage. Be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, in all due respect to you, I find this to be a very strange Amendment and I'll get to some of those concerns in a minute. Does... does... It appears to me that the language of the Amendment not only would cover a grant, an outright grant, which we all could agree is certainly the deliverance of state tax dollars for a particular purpose. But as I read this, it would also cover a project that is assisted by a low-interest loan.

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Or am I reading it incorrectly? Am I reading something that isn't there? But it's the way I... my perception is that this goes far beyond what the normal prevailing wage language would be on a straight grant. But it seems to me that this expands prevailing wage to somebody who goes to the link deposit program or any of the number of programs run by the comptroller or the treasurer and gets a low-interest loan, would then be obligated to do the prevailing wage, even though the loan may be a very small part of the total project cost."

Smith: "Yes, Representative Black, my understanding is that any project funded by the development authority would be covered by the Prevailing Wage Act. So, that would be any project that they approve."

Black: "So, it would include then a project that has... Ya know, one of... Well, before I get off on that. It would include any project put together that even had a low-interest loan backed by the State of Illinois?"

Smith: "That's my understanding."

Black: "All right. I've been involved in economic development since 1981 when I worked for a community college and we formed an economic development corporation in the Danville area at that time because we knew that State Government, as you'll recall, I think the unemployment rate in Rockford in the 80-8... 1980-81 was in the 20 percent range and my area was in the 19-20 percent range. We were shifting from the heavy industrial model, post-World War II, to an entirely new model. Plants were closing all across the state. We

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

formed an economic development corporation because we knew the state couldn't do it and we knew the Federal Government would not do it. So, if we were to survive we had to do it. And we raised a lot of private money and it has worked fairly well for the last 21 or 22 years. And in that... in that time we have put together some very creative packages. We have had banks pool private dollars at... to spread the risk, to lower the interest rate. We've gone out to taxing bodies and asked for a five or a ten-year abatement on property taxes. There have been enterprise legislation, tax increment financing legislation, link deposit, and sometimes even the outright grants through a number of programs that DCCA has. So, you may put together a \$45 million construction project that will create 200 jobs and out of that \$45 million you've got a mix of public and private dollars and now you're telling me that that project will be prevailing wage, regardless of how the financing package is put together."

Smith: "Well, let me clarify, Representative Black, that again this only applies to those projects under this development authority, which is the Western Illinois Economic Development Authority..."

Black: "Well, you know I..."

Smith: "...which is a new authority we're creating."

Black: "...and that was gonna be my next question,
Representative, and for the life of me I don't understand
that at all. I mean, as somebody who lives on the eastern
border of Illinois, I probably oughta sit down and vote for

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

it and say everybody you chased out of Western Illinois by higher wage rates or higher contract price, maybe we can get 'em to come over in the Vermilion Advantage Economic Development area and we'll be glad to work with 'em. I... why in the world..."

Smith: "Right."

Black: "...would you just want this to apply to one particular economic development association in the State of Illinois?

I don't think that's gonna enhance your competitiveness."

Smith: "No, we're... we're simply putting it on this Bill to bring this in line with what we did on Senate Bill 1212 and I suspect that we'll be doing it on other similar programs and authorities throughout the state. So, this is just for some conformity with what we did already this week in Senate Bill 1212."

Black: "Well, heavens... heavens the... heaven forbid we'd ever do something that wasn't in conformity. All right. Representative, I thank you. As always, you give good answers to the questions. While I may not agree with the answers, at least you give forthright answers. Speaker, to the Amendment. I... we're not... I'm not gonna ask for a Roll Call on the Amendment, we'll do that on Third Reading shortly. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment absolutely makes no sense to me whatsoever. Why you want to tie the hands of an economic development corporation when we're still in the midst of changing from the economy that Illinois was when I was a young lad back in the '50s, trying desperately to change with... to meet worldwide

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

competition that didn't exist when I... again, when I was a young lad. Trying to put up with competition that NAFTA has created, sometimes that's very unfair competition, quite frankly. And why, all of a sudden, you'd wanna hamstring an economic development corporation and say even if you go to the bank and get a state-backed loan, the bank will advance the money and the bank will be assured of at least principle repayment by a linked-state program that you're gonna then make that project subject to all of the prevailing wage laws even though the state participation may by limited to a loan guarantee and may be limited to 5 percent of the total project cost, is a strange way... a strange signal to send to business that might be looking at western Illinois that we are gonna raise your contract cost, we're gonna raise your construction cost by a considerable amount. And even covering an entity that might want to use a linked deposit that's a private entity, a private college, a catholic institution, or whatever. There are any number of creative things we've done. think this is a very, very anticompetitive Amendment and I don't... Representative, you know more about your district than I do, but I've gotta tell ya it may benefit my district, I don't know. If somebody... if somebody finds that a project is just too expensive to build because of your Amendment on this Bill and they wanna come to my area, I'm gonna tell ya, I'd fight like heck to keep this Amendment ever applying to the Vermilion Advantage Economic

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Development Corporation. I stand in strong opposition to your Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Myers: Amendment. I think Representative Black stated the reasons for the opposition very eloquently. But on a very personal basis, western Illinois is were I represent. I applaud the Senate Sponsor for introducing this particular piece of legislation because he, as a resident of that area, has realized that over the many, many years in the past, western Illinois has lagged behind in economic development over the rest of this... other areas of the state for one very simple reason, and that is we don't have the miles of interstate or four-lane highways that the rest of the state has. For years you could take an outline of the State of Illinois and superimpose the four-lane highways on that and almost all other areas of the state have them except western Illinois. Today we are getting those four-lane highways, very slowly, but we are getting them. applaud the Senate Sponsor for introducing this to provide us another tool to help move the economic development process along in the State of Illinois. In talking to the Senate Sponsor, he had no intentions of this Amendment ever going on this particular Bill and in talking to the economic development directors over there on that side of the state, they see this as another hindrance in helping them move the economic development process along from Quincy to Canton, from Monmouth to Jacksonville, and areas

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

in between. I reluctantly rise to oppose this Amendment because I know that the House Sponsor is well-intentioned in providing good, honorable wages to the people that would be affected by this. But I think in the competitive environment in which we operate in, not only in western Illinois but in the entire State of Illinois, to do this... to put this Amendment on and add another additional expense to the economic development attempts in western Illinois is going to again make it that much more difficult for us to see economic growth in western Illinois."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. There are several notes that have been requested on the Bill that have not been filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1154? 1154."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1154 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 417?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 417 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 75? 75."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 75 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, do you have an Adjournment Resolution?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution 38, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, May 23, 2003, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 27, 2003 at 2:00 p.m.; and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 23, 2003, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 27, 2003 at 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady, are you seeking recognition on this matter? Mr. Black, are you seeking recognition on this matter? We're on the order of the Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Black."
- Black: "I would rise to a point of personal privilege and an inquiry of the Chair when you're through with the Adjournment Resolution, although I am not in agreement with the Adjournment Resolution."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is... the... the question before the Body is the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution, HJR 38 is adopted. Mr. Black."

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what got into me, the 'no' was a little louder than I... than I wanted. I apologize for that."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Am I in trouble, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "No, never. You know that."

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Not with that smile. Let me make an announcement that may influence your remarks. The Chair plans to extend the deadlines on Bills remaining on the Calendar and also on the Order of Concurrence until May 31 this year. So, for those of you who may be concerned about a matter which is pending on the Calendar up against a deadline, all of the deadlines will be extended to May 31.

Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We have extended the deadline on these Bills to the point where I think they are seeking eternal life. But I simply rise, and I do not speak for the Republican Caucus, I speak as a Member who has spent a considerable amount of time here and I only speak for myself but I know there are others who have joined me on both sides of the aisle in saying, ya know, once again we're down to crunch time, we're a week from adjournment, we're going home for a three-day weekend. That means we come back here on Tuesday, I've been around long enough to know that we'll see the Budget Implementation Act on Wednesday, could very well be asked to vote on it Thursday, still trying to clear the Calendar

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

somewhat on Tuesday, and hope to adjourn by Friday. For whatever it's worth and with my newfound ability to chant and meditate, I'm not gonna go bonkers on you. much prefer to stay in Springfield Saturday, Sunday, and even Monday if that'd be the case, clear the Calendar, clear the Calendar, and start to work in some kind of reasonable fashion on the Budget Implementation Act, because that's where the rubber meets the road. where things happen, and that's where often we don't take enough time, we don't ... we cast votes on things that we just simply haven't had time to read. I compliment you, Mr. Speaker, I think this year has been much more of an open process. I appreciate the fact you let us have a Committee of the Whole on the education budget. But I... I just want the record to reflect, and I know I'm not alone. But I would much rather stay as the original schedule had us, stay here, clear the Calendar, and then have at least two days to review and debate and have a caucus or two on what is in the Budget Implementation Act. What are the revenue Is rolling stock in or is rolling stock out? streams? All of us have hundreds of questions like that. My fear is we come back on Tuesday, we piddle with the Calendar a little bit, the Implementation Act hits sometime Wednesday late or Thursday early and then we go home on Friday. don't think that is a good way to business. We've made a lot of progress this year. The original Calendar had us here, I planned on us being here. I want the record to reflect that I fully... I would... I would gladly stay here

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

and the per diem can be donated to charity or we don't even hav... or I don't even have to sign in. I'm not worried about the per diem. What I am worried about is... is before I leave this chamber just once I'd like to really be able to have time and not the pressure to look at the revenue stream and how that's implemented in the budget Act. I think we need to stay here. If I'm a minority of one, sobeit."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like the record to be reflective that on our last vote, House Bill 2700, Senate Amendment #2, that I would like to be a 'yes'. I inadvertently pushed 'no' on that particular vote. If the record would reflect that."

Speaker Madigan: "Your statement will be so reflected. Mr. Clerk, do you have Agreed Resolutions?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 327, offered by Representative Yarbrough. House Resolution 330, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 331, offered by Representative Hannig. House Resolution 332, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 333, offered by Representative Osterman. House Resolution 334, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 335, offered by Representative Capparelli. House Resolution 336, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 337, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 338, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 340, offered by Representative Lou Jones. House Resolution 340, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell. House Resolution 343,

64th Legislative Day

5/23/2003

offered by Representative Grunloh. House Resolution 342, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 344, offered by Representative Grunloh. House Resolution 347, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 349, offered by Representative Bost. House Resolution 350, offered by Representative Hannig. House Resolution 351, offered by Representative Smith. House Resolution 353, offered by Representative Forby. House Resolution 356, offered by Representative Morrow. House Resolution 358, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 360, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 361, offered by Representative Brauer and House Resolution 362, offered by Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Agreed Resolutions.

Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Currie moves that the House do stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, May 27 at 2 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 27 at 2 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."